
SIGILLVM · VNIVERSITATIS · CALIFORNIENSIS
LVX
FIAT
MDCCCLXVIII
EX LIBRIS

The True William Penn

Uniform with this Volume

THE TRUE GEORGE WASHINGTON. By Paul Leicester Ford. Illustrated. $2.00

THE TRUE BENJAMIN FRANKLIN. By Sydney George Fisher. Illustrated. $2.00

The True George Washington, The True Benjamin Franklin, and The True William Penn. Three volumes in a box, $6.00

OTHER WORKS
BY SYDNEY GEORGE FISHER

MEN, WOMEN, AND MANNERS IN COLONIAL TIMES. Two volumes. 12mo. Illustrated. $3.00

THE MAKING OF PENNSYLVANIA. 12mo. Red buckram, $1.50

THE EVOLUTION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES. 12mo. Red buckram, $1.50

PENNSYLVANIA: COLONY AND COMMONWEALTH. 12mo. Red buckram, $1.50

ARMOR PORTRAIT OF PENN IN THE POSSESSION OF MAJOR WILLIAM DUGALD STUART

The True William Penn

By

Sydney George Fisher

Author of "The True Benjamin Franklin," "Men, Women, and Manners in Colonial Times," "The Making of Pennsylvania," "The Evolution of the Constitution," etc.

Illustrated

"In deeds of daring rectitude"

George Eliot

Philadelphia
J. B. Lippincott Company
1900

F152
.2
F5

Copyright, 1899
by
J. B. Lippincott Company

UNIV. OF
CALIFORNIA

Electrotyped and Printed by J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia, U. S. A.

Contents

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	The Man	11
II.	The Times	31
III.	Admiral Penn	39
IV.	Early Influences	58
V.	The Quakers	67
VI.	Cavalier or Quaker; or Both	95
VII.	First Imprisonment and Roughness of English Life	107
VIII.	Controversy, First Principles, and Imprisonment	121
IX.	Trial by Jury and Hat Honor	138
X.	Penn becomes Rich, and also, they said, a Dangerous Man	151
XI.	Rest and a Sweetheart	162
XII.	Persecution, Oaths, and Controversy	173
XIII.	Travels in Holland and Politics at Home	181
XIV.	The Holy Experiment of Pennsylvania	197
XV.	Great Care with the Constitution and Laws	217
XVI.	First Visit to the Province	229
XVII.	Returns to England and becomes a Courtier	252
XVIII.	Supports the Despotism of James II.	280
XIX.	Suspicions, Conspiracies, and Hiding	302
XX.	Returns to his Old Way of Life	337
XXI.	Pennsylvania Again	343
XXII.	A Courtier Again, and Again in Prison	360
XXIII.	The End	377

224094

List of Illustrations with Notes

PAGE

ARMOR PORTRAIT OF PENN IN THE POSSESSION OF MAJOR WILLIAM DUGALD STUART . *Frontispiece.*

From a photograph of the painting by permission of Major Stuart. The other armor portrait in England in the possession of J. Merrick Head, Esq., could not be photographed, because of extensive alterations at Mr. Head's country seat, Pennsylvania Castle.

ARMOR PORTRAIT OF PENN IN THE PENNSYLVANIA HISTORICAL SOCIETY 13

From a photograph of the painting by permission of the Historical Society

THE PLACE PORTRAIT OF PENN 15

From a photograph of the copy of the painting by Francis Place, in Independence Hall, Philadelphia. Permission to photograph the original in England could not be obtained.

THE HALL ENGRAVING OF THE BEVAN CARVING . . 17

From a photograph of the Hall engraving in the possession of the Pennsylvania Historical Society.

THE BEVAN CARVING OF PENN 18

From a photograph of the carving in the collection of Alfred Waterhouse, Esq., Yattendon Court, Berkshire, England. The carving appears to have been cut out of a piece of ivory too small for it, so that the back of the head has not the fulness it should have. Or it may be the carving was an alto-relievo with a background from which it has been removed.

THE QUAKER MEETING 20

From a photograph of the engraving in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS WITH NOTES

PAGE

PENN AND FOX 22

From an enlarged photograph of the engraving of the Quaker Meeting in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

THE RICHARDSON PORTRAIT OF PENN 24

From a photograph of the original painting in the possession of Mr. E. G. Kennedy, of New York.

ADMIRAL PENN 55

From a photograph of the painting by Sir Peter Lely, in Greenwich Hospital, London.

GULI SPRINGETT, PENN'S FIRST WIFE 163

From a photograph of an old stipple engraving.

ALGERNON SYDNEY 192

From a photograph of an old engraving in the collection of Mr. Joseph Y. Jeans, of Philadelphia.

LETITIA STREET HOUSE 239

From a photograph of the house now in Fairmount Park, Philadelphia.

WEST'S PICTURE OF THE GREAT TREATY 243

From a photograph of the original painting in Independence Hall, Philadelphia. It was painted by West, in 1773, at the request of the Penn family, and purchased from Granville John Penn in 1851 by Mr. Joseph Harrison, of Philadelphia.

SUPPOSED WAMPUM BELT OF THE GREAT TREATY . 246

From a photograph of the belt now in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. The belt was given to the Society in 1857 by a member of the Penn family, among whom it was traditionally believed to have been given to Penn by the Indians at the time of the Great Treaty.

JAMES II., DUKE OF YORK 254

From a photograph of an engraving in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

WILLIAM III. 304

From a photograph of an engraving in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS WITH NOTES

PAGE

HANNAH CALLOWHILL, PENN'S SECOND WIFE . . . 339

From a photograph of the copy of the painting by Place, in Independence Hall, Philadelphia. Permission to photograph the original in England could not be obtained.

PENN'S SON THOMAS. 340

From a photograph of the engraving by Martin, in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

PENNSYLVANIA CASTLE 341

From a photograph of the painting in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. The castle was built about 1815, by John Penn, son of Thomas, and grandson of William Penn. In 1887 it passed from the Penn family into the possession of its present owner, J. Merrick Head, Esq.

JAMES LOGAN 349

From a photograph of the painting formerly at Stenton, and now in the possession of Mr. A. C. Logan, of Philadelphia.

THE SLATE-ROOF HOUSE 351

From a photograph of the engraving in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

PENN'S BIBLE, WITH BOOK-PLATE 375

From a photograph of the Bible in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. The motto on the book-plate, "Dum Clavum Teneam," is an abbreviated form of the motto, "Dum Clavum Rectum Teneam," which means, "If I hold a steady helm," or, freely, "If I am not negligent."

PENN'S WRITING-DESK 379

From a photograph of the desk in the Philadelphia Library.

PENN'S BURIAL-PLACE, JORDAN'S MEETING-HOUSE. . 384

From a photograph taken by Mr. Julius F. Sachse. Jordan's Meeting-House is in Buckinghamshire, west of London.

The True William Penn

I

THE MAN

WILLIAM PENN is now usually thought of as a pious, contemplative man, a peace-loving Quaker in a broad brim hat and plain drab clothes, who founded Pennsylvania in the most successful manner, on beautiful, benevolent principles, and kindness to the Indians.

But the real Penn, though of a very religious turn of mind, was essentially a man of action, restless and enterprising, at times a courtier and a politician, who loved handsome dress, lived well and lavishly, and, although he undoubtedly kept his faith with the red-men, Pennsylvania was the torment of his life. He came, moreover, of fighting ancestry, and was himself a soldier for a short time. His life was full of contests, imprisonments, disasters, and suffering, if not of actual fighting, and he lived during the most critical periods of English history. Few, if any, Quakers have shown so much energy as he. Indeed, there have been few men who have at-

tempted to accomplish so much. With what success we shall see.

The portraits which we have of him are unfortunately very unsatisfactory sources from which to learn his personal appearance. Some of them are entirely imaginary, and the others are either of doubtful authenticity or made from recollection. There is, in fact, no portrait of Penn which is positively known to have been painted from life.

The picture of him most familiar to Americans is an engraving by Schoff made from a painting in the Pennsylvania Historical Society, which represents him as a young cavalier in armor at the age, as is supposed, of twenty-two. There is also a smaller engraving by Armstrong less well known, but taken from the same painting with the assistance of a photograph * of a similar painting in England. The engravings are substantially alike, but by no means faithful copies of the painting from which they are taken, or of the photograph of the painting in England. They are, however, very beautiful pictures, idealizing the qualities of the painting and representing Penn as most heroic and attractive.

He is already a good deal idealized in the painting from which they are taken, and appears as a fresh-faced, rosy-lipped, but very serious-minded, English youth, clad in armor, his hair parted in the middle, and the long cavalier locks reaching to his shoulders. A handsome piece of lace is wound several times

* This photograph is now in the collection of Hon. James T. Mitchell, of Philadelphia.

THE ARMOR PORTRAIT OF PENN IN THE PENNSYLVANIA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

round his neck, and the ends, gathered in a bunch at the throat, rest on the polished breast-plate.

The face and eyes look straight at you with intense and almost startling earnestness. There is no sense of humor in the features, or even youthful gayety. At first sight you might say that the face was melancholy; but close inspection leads you to describe it as over-serious, too earnest for the time of life.

There is great determination expressed in it,—that sort of wild determination which, when combined with a lack of education, makes what is called the fanatic. But, at the same time, every line in the portrait shows that the young man is of cultured and good associations, and belongs to the best class of his time. The eyes are very large, and it is in them that this wild determination principally resides; and, at the same time, they have an appealing, soft, lustrous look. Gentle, sympathetic, and ideal qualities are evidently combined in a tumultuous way with some sort of an heroic soul. It is precisely the sort of picture one would paint after a careful study of Penn's life. There is no trace of shrewdness, subtle tact, or deep sagacity, which in the previous volume of this series we found to be so characteristic of Franklin's face.

We can easily imagine that Penn might have looked like this. We know that he was very religious; and the face of this portrait is not the hard, cunning face of the ecclesiastic, nor the sour face of the Puritan. It belongs to another type of that strangely religious age, the type of the smaller sects, who were more radical than either Puritan or Church-

man, who were not plotting for political control, who took their mystical religion to heart with simple, unworldly, reckless earnestness, and went with it to the prison or to the stake.

Whatever decision may be reached as to the authenticity of these armor portraits, they will always be valued by Penn's admirers as idealizations of his qualities. It is, indeed, hard to resist the fascination of pictures which take all the heroic and intellectual qualities of the mature man and depict them in his boyish face, as foreshadowing what he was to be.

The armor portrait in the possession of the Pennsylvania Historical Society, was given by Granville Penn in 1833, and is described in the Society's Catalogue of Paintings as "entirely authentic." It was for a long time believed by the uninitiated to be an original, and the statement usually made was that the family had had two of these portraits, both painted from life and by the same artist, and had retained one of them after giving the other to the Historical Society. But recently, in cleaning the one belonging to the Historical Society, it was found to be of very modern date, and seems to have been painted within the first half of the nineteenth century.

It might be supposed that the one remaining in England in the possession of Major William Dugald Stuart might have been taken from life; but now it appears that there is another of these armor portraits in the possession of J. Merrick Head, Esq., of Pennsylvania Castle, Dorset. Both are claimed by

THE PLACE PORTRAIT OF PENN

Do not
circulate

their owners to be originals. But connoisseurs have grave doubts of their authenticity because little or nothing is known of their history, and it is not even known by whom they were painted. They are not in the least like the Bevan carving of Penn, the only likeness of him which is at all well authenticated.

A portrait purporting to be a likeness of Penn at the age of fifty-two, painted by Francis Place, was, about the year 1874, found to be in the possession of Mr. Allan, of Blackwell Hall, County Durham, England. Place was an amateur artist, contemporary with Penn, and might have had opportunity to paint a portrait of him from life. It should be said, however, that Quakers were very averse to sitting for their portraits, because it savored of vanity and injured their standing among those whose good opinion was of value. But still Place might have seen Penn at various times and painted him from recollection.*

Those who accept this Place portrait as anything of a likeness can the more easily believe in the armor portraits. The face is very much the same in each; in each we find the same rather staring, anxious eyes; and it is possible to imagine that the Place portrait is the man grown much older, stouter, and with the look of uncertain energy changed into one of more settled and steady determination.

The Place portrait has also some of that same over-seriousness which is so noticeable in the armor

---

*Scribner's Magazine, vol. xii. p. 6; Pennsylvania Historical Society, Catalogue of Paintings, p. 27.

portrait, and also in the portrait of Penn's father, the admiral. In fact, the resemblance is so close that those who have carefully studied the subject are disposed to think, and with good reason, that the Place portrait is a likeness of the admiral and not of his son.* The decisive point, however, is that this Place portrait is totally unlike the Bevan carving, which I shall now describe.

When Lord Cobham was adorning his gardens at Stowe with statuary towards the middle of the eighteenth century, some years after the death of Penn, he sought for a portrait of Penn to be copied, but could not fine one. A certain Sylvanus Bevan, a Quaker apothecary in London, skilful in amateur carving, hearing of this, made a little ivory bust of Penn as he recollected him and sent it to Lord Cobham without explanation. His lordship, it is said, on receiving it, exclaimed, "Whence came this? It is William Penn himself;" and he had a statue made from it for his gardens.

This tale, if true, is somewhat against the validity of the armor and Place portraits, for Lord Cobham, after inquiry only a few years after Penn's death, was, it is said, unable to hear of any portrait of him. It should also be noted that Clarkson, who published his memoirs of Penn in 1814 and was very diligent in collecting traditions of him, says that there was no portrait of him painted from life. He relies entirely on the Bevan carving.†

---

* Jenkins's Family of William Penn, p. 28.

† Clarkson's Memoirs of Penn, vol. ii. p. 260.

THE HALL ENGRAVING OF THE BEVAN CARVING

The Bevan bust, or carving, though small, is said to have been a good likeness. Robert Proud, the Quaker historian of Pennsylvania, who was in England in 1750 and stayed with Bevan, reports of it:

"The likeness is a real and true one, as I have been informed, not only by himself (S. B.), but also by other old men in England of the first character in the Society of Friends, who knew him in their youth." (Watson's Annals, edition of 1844, p. 111.)*

Bevan is said to have made three of these ivory carvings of Penn. He sent one of them to Pennsylvania, to James Logan, and it found its way with the Loganian Library to the Philadelphia Library, where it was, unfortunately, burnt in a slight fire which occurred there in 1831. I have been unable to find any one who recollects its appearance or who has ever heard it described. Until the armor portrait was brought to this country, the Bevan carving and engravings of it were all that people had to rely upon who wished to know what Penn looked like.

An excellent engraving of the Philadelphia Bevan carving was made by John Hall in 1773. But fortunately we do not have to rely exclusively on this engraving. One of the two other carvings that Bevan made is still in existence in England, and I

---

* Mr. Charles Henry Hart has called my attention to another proof that the Bevan carving is probably a correct likeness. In the *American Universal Magazine* for January 2, 1797, there is an engraving by Smithers of the Bevan carving taken from a drawing by Du Simitière, and under it is printed, "esteemed by Richard Penn a good likeness."

have been so fortunate as to obtain a photograph of it.* There is no essential difference between the photograph and the engraving; and after an examination of them it is impossible to resist the conclusion that they represent a man totally different from the one we see in the armor portraits or in the Place portrait. The Bevan portrait has a very pointed nose, which is not found in the others, and the whole expression of the face is different.

The armor portraits and the Place portrait show a very anxious, serious face. In a sense this might be natural, because we know that Penn had many troubles and anxieties. But, on the other hand, the serene, cheerful face of the Bevan portrait conforms to the tradition and the assertions of his biographers that he took all his difficulties, his imprisonments, and his loss of fortune very lightly, and was fully sustained in his worst trials by his sanguine and courageous temperament. If the Bevan portrait is anything of a correct likeness, and I believe it is, it is impossible to believe in the other pictures.

There is a picture described by Mr. Julius F. Sachse in his "German Pietists in America," painted by a Dutch artist, Egbert Hemskirck, representing a Quaker meeting, in which one of the figures is supposed to be Penn. Hemskirck was a contemporary of Penn, and his picture represents a meeting of Quakers in Benjamin Furly's house in Rotterdam.

* It is in the possession of Alfred Waterhouse, Esq., R.A., Yattendon Court, Berkshire. I may add that the Pennsylvania Historical Society has a copy in marble of the Bevan carving that was in Philadelphia.

THE BEVAN CARVING OF PENN

The figure on the extreme right is supposed to be George Fox ; the one next to him, with his right foot resting on the bench, is Penn. Both Fox and Penn, it will be observed, are in English dress, and the rest of the people appear to be Dutch.

It would seem at first sight as if the picture was intended to be somewhat in ridicule of the Quakers, for most of the people are given rather ill-looking faces except Furly, who is on the left leaning on the gallery with his hat off. But it probably represents an ordinary Quaker meeting of the time, as the artist had seen them. Furly was a rich man and the patron and protector of the Quakers in Holland. He was a close friend of Penn, and Penn and Fox are known to have held meetings with him in the year 1677. It will be observed that the Dutch artist's representation of Penn gives him the pointed nose which we find in the Bevan carving. He looks like the active, busy, energetic man of affairs he was ; but there is nothing religious about the face. It is, however, very life-like and interesting, and I am inclined to have some confidence in it.

There is a German engraving of Penn by Kuhner, often reproduced, and purporting to be taken from a portrait by Sir Godfrey Kneller, who was a well-known court painter in Penn's time. But nothing is known of the original picture which this engraving professes to reproduce, and it is generally believed to be a copy of the Bevan carving, which it closely resembles.

Still another portrait of Penn has recently come to light and is now owned in America. It is believed

to be by Jonathan Richardson, who was a well-known artist and a contemporary of Penn. It has the pointed nose and double chin of the Bevan carving, and cannot, therefore, be rejected by the critics. It is well painted, animated, and the green coat and careful details make it an exceedingly interesting picture.

There are rumors that there was at one time a portrait of Penn by Sir Peter Lely, who painted the likeness of Penn's father, but the picture itself has not yet been discovered.

Benjamin West's picture of the famous treaty with the Indians gives us a representation of Penn, but it is purely imaginary. The large, full-length portrait painted by Inman for the Penn Society, and now in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, merely follows West's representation, and as it is also purely imaginary and adds nothing to our knowledge of Penn's real appearance, it has not been reproduced for this book. For the same reason the old lead statue in front of the Pennsylvania Hospital has been omitted.

The large bronze statue which was cast some years ago for the tower of the City Hall, in Philadelphia, represents Penn as tall, vigorous, and handsome, as he is supposed to have been when he was about forty years old and first took possession of Pennsylvania. This statue, though by no means what was desired and expected, was modelled after careful consultation with the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, and particular attention was given to the dress. It is the cavalier costume of the period, with the sword, the

THE QUAKER MEETING

feather in the hat, and the silver trimmings on the coat omitted. This is believed to have been Penn's dress for a long time after he became a Quaker. He even for a time, it is said, wore his sword. He was rather fond of good clothes. He altered the dress which marked his class and station in life only by making it somewhat plainer than that of the gay cavalier.

This seems to have been the practice of all the early Quakers. They did not adopt a distinctive dress, but made the one they were accustomed to plainer. The broad-brim hat and straight-cut coat were not the original Quaker costume. It was the shifting and changing of fashions, and excessive ornamentation, that they particularly disliked. Many of them, especially in Pennsylvania in colonial times, while adhering to one fashion, wore clothes of the most handsome and expensive materials. The sculptor, however, took liberties with the instructions of the Historical Society, and has probably represented Penn less plain than he really was, and in a way that does not add to the dignity of the statue.

The more we investigate Penn's personal appearance the more confusing we find the accounts of it. Not only do we find his portraits contradictory, but we find some writers describing him as a tall man, others as above the medium height, and others as a short man. In Watson's "Annals of Pennsylvania" the recollections are given of an old woman who professed to have seen him when he visited his province.

"She described him as of rather short stature, but the handsomest, best-looking, lively gentleman she had ever seen. There was nothing like pride about him; but affable and friendly with the humblest in life." (Vol. i. p. 55.)

Clarkson, relying, I presume, on traditions gathered among the English Quakers, describes him as a tall man; and I am inclined to think this is correct. Hemskirck's painting of the Quaker meeting represents him as rather tall, and Hemskirck would be apt to give his figure correctly. He might be inaccurate in his recollections of Penn's face, but he could easily remember whether he was tall or short.

Penn was a man of education, and, indeed, quite learned. He knew something of Latin, and corresponded in that tongue with Sewell the Quaker historian. He also studied Greek, as a matter of course, like any Oxford man, and he seems to have known French, German, and Dutch well enough to read and speak in them. He read widely on theology, government, and all the topics of his time, as is abundantly shown in his writings. But the most striking proof of his wide reading is to be found in some of his essays or pamphlets, to which he has added quotations and citations of all the ancient and modern authors that he could find in support of his theses. In his "Treatise of Oaths," there are over fifty instances in which he either quotes the words or states the opinion of some Greek or Roman philosopher or statesman, or of some saint or father of the church. In the second part of "No Cross, No Crown," there are over one hundred and thirty

PENN AND FOX

of these instances, and they range from the most remote antiquity through the days of Greece and Rome, and the distinguished men of the Middle Ages, down to the men of his own day in England. The labor of hunting for these in the libraries of the time must have been very great, and he could not have collected such masses for the particular occasions on which he used them, unless he was already somewhat acquainted with them in a general way.

It is easy to see in his life and character that he was inspired by this labor. He loved great and noble thoughts, grand ideas of world-wide improvement and reform. This passion led him to read the lives of all who had been remarkable, and their soul-stirring words, the enthusiasm of their success, or the heroism of failure or defeat, stimulated to still loftier heights the passion that had led him to this study.

He was evidently one of those who study history largely through biographies; and if one wishes to be aroused and inspired, that is certainly the best method to pursue. From his natural bent, and these studies, he had filled his mind with all the most progressive and philanthropic ideas that had been suggested in the whole course of written human history. He knew all the distinguished men in England of his day; and many of them he knew very intimately. He travelled, both in England and in foreign countries, more than most people of that time. He was born and educated among the aristocracy, and always associated with them freely; and, as a Quaker, he became very intimate with the middle and lower classes.

He was certainly in a way to be a man of enlarged mind; and, in truth, he was too much so. His liberality was developed at the expense, as we shall see, of many practical qualities. Although he had read so many biographies, he was not a shrewd judge of the characters by whom he was surrounded in actual life. He could arouse people into enthusiasm for his great ideas, but he had not a corresponding power for carrying those ideas into practical effect. When living in his colony he managed it well, and when away from it he managed it very badly; and he was a careless man of business. He planned everything on a vast scale, with an attempt to look far into the future. He was so far in advance of his time in everything that he constantly suffered defeats, which a shrewder man, like Franklin, for example, would have avoided by being more moderate. He knew that he was much ahead of his age, but he would not be otherwise; and, indeed, there is much to be said in favor of setting a high and absolute standard and holding to it heroically.

It was a great misfortune to him that in his religious and political writings he lacked the power of lucid and concise expression. He was a rather voluminous writer; but in politics and theology a very dull one. When he had a good thought, he usually suffocated it in an inextricable tangle of words and parentheses. His writings could be made excellent object-lessons to show how not to use the parenthesis. When he sat down to write one of his essays, he seems to have tried to make it as long as possible,

THE RICHARDSON PORTRAIT OF PENN

to use as many words as possible, and to interpolate all manner of irrelevant things so as to prevent his phrases from having any point or snap. It is a dreary business to dig out his opinions after having written a life of the vivid, sparkling, pointed Franklin.

He never trained himself in conciseness as Franklin did. In fact, he did not train himself at all in writing. He would probably have despised anything of that kind as over-nice and too particular. "To be nice," he says, in his maxims, "is not only a troublesome, but a slavish thing." The bent of his mind was altogether away from the minute details which produce excellence of this sort. He was all for great ideas and generalities.

Sometimes when circumstances compelled him to be concise, his style greatly improved, and he said things which are of permanent value for the way in which they are put. In drafting the documents that the government of Pennsylvania, he had to be brief and several of his statements of principles are so often quoted and admired for their aptness.

"There is hardly one frame of government in the world so ill designed by its founders, that in good hands would not do well enough."

"Any government is free to the people under it (whatever be the frame) where the laws rule and the people are a party to those laws."

His famous letter to his wife and children on his departure for Pennsylvania, and his description of that province sent to the Free Society of Traders, are also remarkably free from his usual faults, and written in very mellow, pretty language. Some of his more important correspondence is also written in

this same happy manner. His biographer, Stoughton, thinks that, if Penn had cared to, he could always have written in this vein, but that in most of his writings he thought it necessary to adopt the canting language which had become habitual and sacred among the Quakers.

When he was nearly fifty years old, and obliged to conceal himself after the Revolution of 1688, he wrote an essay called "Some Fruits of Solitude," containing five hundred and fifty-six "maxims and eflections," the result of his experience of life, and ontemplation of it in retirement. Afterwards, he vrote another essay called "More Fruits of Soli- ıde," and this contains two hundred and ninety- ne maxims. It is curious to observe that when · confines a maxim to ten or a dozen words, it ten has some point. But he could not always ·train himself. Many of the maxims are enlarged to good-sized paragraphs, and have to be read .ice to see their meaning.

I can assure the reader that it is a real penance to .ead through these eight hundred and fifty maxims. I have performed that task and gathered the dozen or so grains of wheat out of the ton of—I was about to say chaff; but I can hardly apply that word to so much sound morality and spiritual sentiment merely because it has the misfortune to be cumbersomely expressed. We can, at least, say that those who complain of Franklin's maxims as too shrewd and worldly, too thrifty and money-getting, will not be able to make that complaint of Penn's. The tone of all that Penn says is excellent

and elevating. We shall grow rich under his advice only in generosity, magnanimity, liberty, and human kindness.

"They have a right to censure that have a heart to help."

"Never marry but for love; but see that thou lov'st what is lovely."

"There can be no friendship where there is no freedom."

"Some men do as much begrudge others a good name as they want one themselves; and perhaps that is the reason of it."

"Nor can we fall below the arms of God, how low soever it be we fall."

Some of his maxims on education are interesting because so far in advance of his time, and because they embody the same ideas which Franklin afterwards amplified and sought to establish in the College of Philadelphia.

"We are in pain to make them scholars, but not men! To talk, rather than to know; which is true canting."

"The first thing obvious to children is what is sensible; and that we make no part of their rudiments."

"We press their memory too soon, and puzzle, strain, and load them with words and rules; to know grammar and rhetoric, and a strange tongue or two, that it is ten to one may never be useful to them; leaving their natural genius to mechanical and physical or natural knowledge uncultivated and neglected; which would be of exceeding use and pleasure to them through the whole course of their life."

"To be sure, languages are not to be despised or neglected. But things are still to be preferred."

"Children had rather be making of tools and instruments of play, shaping, drawing, framing, and building, &c., than getting some rules of propriety of speech by heart. And those also would follow with more judgment, and less trouble and time."

For one of his maxims he certainly deserves credit, and the maxim deserves a wide circulation.

"To do evil that good may come of it is for bunglers in politics as well as morals."

His description of the wise man is also rather good.

"The wise man is cautious, but not cunning; judicious but not crafty; making virtue the measure of using his excellent understanding in the conduct of his life."

"The wise man is equal, ready, but not officious."

His maxim, "The less form in religion the better, since God is a spirit," is a very complete though brief summary of his religion and the religion of the Quakers. In his letter to William Popple, he, without perhaps intending it, made an excellent maxim.

"We can never be the better for our religion if our neighbor be the worse for it."

There is only one of his maxims that savors at all of the keen shrewdness of Franklin's. It, perhaps, can be applied to our own times.

"Let the people think they govern and they will be governed."

According to Bishop Burnet, Penn's conversation was even more wordy and cumbersome than his political writings.

"He was a vain talking man. He had such an opinion of his own faculty of persuading, that he thought none could stand before it, though he was singular in that opinion; for he had a tedious, luscious way of talking not apt to overcome a man's reason, though it might tire his patience."

There may be some truth in this statement. Penn was an enthusiast, and when talking on his favorite themes he very likely heaped up the words and bore

down opposition by energy and long-windedness. He was "luscious," or nauseatingly eloquent, as the word may be translated, from excessive zeal in his subject. Burnet himself was also afflicted in that way.

But other and less prejudiced persons than Burnet found great pleasure in Penn's conversation, and there is every reason to believe that it was by no means so dull as his writing. Swift, who was surely a judge of such things, said he "talked very agreeably and with much spirit." Tillotson found great pleasure in his acquaintance; Clarkson calls attention to the *Gentleman's Magazine* of April, 1737, where some one who had travelled with Penn in a stage-coach, says, "And a pleasant companion he was." The tradition among the Quakers in England seems to have been that he was rather animated in conversation and disposed to be facetious; and some of the traditions and anecdotes preserved in Pennsylvania are also to that effect. He certainly had seen a great deal of the world, and this, with his wide reading and genial temperament, must have made his conversation very agreeable when he was not carried away by zeal for his unusual opinions. His usual manner, I am inclined to think from various incidents I have read, was one of bluff heartiness.

It would seem that, until he became a rather old man, Penn was very free from disease. But the details we have of his life are not complete, and he might have had illnesses which have not been recorded. He had a vigorous constitution, and, without it, could hardly have endured, without serious

injury, the frequent imprisonments in pestilential dungeons which he suffered in his youth.

For the rest of his life we find him very actively engaged in the varied business of a leader and organizer of the Quakers, a defender of them from persecution, a politician, a courtier, a founder of a colony, and suffering great losses of fortune and severe anxiety. He was of a sanguine temperament, and this disposition may have contributed to his health. As he grew older he had the gout; but it seems he was careful to take systematic exercise, and the disease never seized him with any great severity.

II

THE TIMES

PENN was born October 14, 1644, and, as we read English history, that seems a troublous time for a child to come into the world, especially a child that was to be a man of peace. England was full of religious and political confusion. The great ideas of government and religion by which we have been living for two hundred years were then struggling for existence in their primitive form, and for the next fifty years were tossed about in the wild tumult of wars, revolution, and religious persecution.

There were two great political parties, the Royalists and the Roundheads, and several great religious parties, the Church of England, the various divisions of the Puritans, and the Roman Catholics, besides numerous fanatical small sects which were fiercely in earnest to establish their principles of politics or religion. At that time the discussion of such principles was not confined to argument. Each party and each religion was prepared for force, to inflict or to suffer martyrdom, to fight or to die in their cause.

For nearly half a century the king had been struggling hard to build up the power and privileges of the crown against Parliament and the people.

James I. had been very diligent in this, and tyranny was gaining in spite of the frantic and spasmodic struggles of the people against it. Tyranny was growing because England was growing. As the island became more and more civilized and began to take a place among the nations, organization became more and more necessary. Regular methodical government must succeed the easy, noble, and manly freedom which was instinctive with the descendants of the Vikings, Angles, and Saxons. The followers of the king and all who admired absolute monarchy or loved place and power took advantage of this necessity to develop royalty and a church established by law, and for a long time they were very successful.

Other things, however, were growing besides the royal power and the Church of England. The great movement of the Reformation, starting in the invention of printing and the revival of learning, was still stimulating independent thought, arousing and encouraging more and more the Puritan sects, and leading them to see their interest in developing the ancient Anglo-Saxon liberties, as the Royalists saw their interest in developing the kingly power.

Strange creatures were those Puritans and other sects who had only recently broken through the restraints of the Middle Ages and begun to think for themselves. From the system of the Middle Ages, which ignored the Bible altogether, they had rushed to the opposite extreme of accepting it so literally that they gave their children the strange un-English names they found in the Old Testament. From the

Church of Rome, which governed as an absolute monarchy and governed too much, the Presbyterians had reacted to a system of representative or republican church government made up of elective assemblies and synods, while others, the Independents and Congregationalists, had reacted to the principle that there should be no general church government at all, and each congregation should be a law unto itself in doctrine and discipline. From the excesses of image worship and ritual they had gone to the extreme of abolishing all ritual, vestments, and images, adopting extemporaneous prayer instead of prayers read from a book, and preaching to a congregation that sat within four bare walls.

They were austere in their manners; they disciplined themselves into a hatred of all amusements and pleasures. They saw the terrible side of religion; they convinced themselves of original sin, with which every man was born, and for which the vast majority of mankind would be burnt forever in hell by a wrathful God who, to gratify his rage and pleasure, had foreordained them to their fate, in spite of the good deeds and works they might do on earth.

They encouraged all feelings that were gloomy and sombre, which were, they thought, alone compatible with religion. They relied on inward experiences and feelings of conversion to supply the place of the dogmas and forms they had rejected. They trained their faces to conform to their feelings, assumed sour, malignant expressions, whined, groaned, and drawled in their speech.

They were accompanied by smaller sects, with minds still more distorted by the new-found liberty of the age,—fifth monarchy men, who believed that Christ was about to come to establish an earthly kingdom for a thousand years. Desperate, dangerous fellows they were; for when the rage of their belief was on them and they thought the kingdom about to come, they would fight like devils, attacking the militia and soldiery with the utmost fury and refusing quarter.

Pepys describes how thirty-one of them, shouting, "The King Jesus and the heads upon the gates!" put all London in terror, routed the trainbands, put the king's lifeguard to the run, broke through the city gates, killed twenty men, and led every one to believe that they numbered five hundred, while every householder armed himself, and forty thousand stood ready to oppose these fierce fanatics.*

Then there were strange antinomian and familistic sects, who found their liberty in dropping the original sin and gloom of the Puritans and believing that there was scarcely any sin at all, and that love and contemplation were religion. Of these we shall have more to say hereafter, for they, together with the Puritans, created a phase of religious thought which had great influence on William Penn, and, indeed, accounts for half his character. The Quakers also were coming into prominence at that time, and they were a very peculiar and important sect, of whom we shall have a great deal to say.

---

* Pepys's Diary, ed. 1893, vol. i. pp. 319–322.

In striking contrast to these strange sects were the Royalists, who stood by the king and the Church of England, with its moderate ceremonies and ritual and its moderate adoption of the ideas of the Reformation. Pleasure-loving and gay, devoted to sports and amusements, dressing fantastically, as it would now seem, in bright colors, with long hair and pointed beards, and all the more devoted to pleasures, theatres, oaths, ribaldry, and licentiousness, because these things were under the ban of Puritanism.

A long and terrible conflict was inevitable between these elements. How to combine the ancient freedom with the necessities of highly-organized government and have both liberty and government at the same time was the problem by whose solution England was to be torn and distracted for the rest of the century. During that time, which in effect covers the life of William Penn, "freedom," as Tennyson has expressed it, "broadened slowly down from precedent to precedent." Slowly hardly describes this movement. It was very slow; often stagnation and sometimes retrogression; and Penn's relation to this movement, which is still a movement, is the most important part of his life's history.

Charles I., who succeeded James I. in 1625, carried the royal power to still greater heights. He levied taxes and imposts as he pleased without authority of law, and governed for many years without any Parliament at all. In fact, he completely eclipsed and for the time being destroyed the ancient liberties and brought royalty to its climax and acme of power.

In the same way, reacting against the whole spirit of the Reformation, he built up the Established Church. He appointed Laud Archbishop of Canterbury, and it is needless to tell again how Laud became the terror and detestation of Puritans, filling the churches with images, elaborating ceremonies, and inflicting degrading punishment on the clergy who inclined to Puritan ways. They were imprisoned, whipped, had their ears cut off, their noses slit, and their cheeks branded with hot irons. We have all heard the story of the Puritan Pryne, who was stood in the pillory, lost both his ears, and was imprisoned for life, because he wrote condemning the balls, theatres, and other amusements of the court.

It was in those days that John Hampden sturdily refused to pay the ship-money, which was an old form of tax by which the seaports had supplied the king with war-vessels. Charles attempted to compel the inland towns to contribute, and Hampden resisted, although the suit against him was for only twenty shillings. Penn, as we shall see, in later years made a similar stand for trial by jury.

We have all read how the reaction by Charles I. against the Reformation brought on a counter-reaction from the Reformation itself; for while despotism grew among the Royalists at court, wild republicanism spread among the people. Charles I. tried to force the Church of England's ritual and ceremonies, upon the Presbyterian Scotch, and when they rose in rebellion and mobbed the bishops he called a Parliament together to grant him an army with

which to suppress them. There had been no Parliament for eleven years ; and this new one was filled with men of the Cromwell and Hampden order. They impeached and executed Laud and Stafford. They abolished the ecclesiastical courts which had been punishing the Puritans. They seized violently on all the rights they had so long declared they possessed. They completely reversed the condition of affairs, and instead of the king ruling without a Parliament, Parliament ruled without the king. He was driven from London, established himself at York, and declared war against his Parliament.

In this way began the great civil war in 1642, and when Penn was born, in October, 1644, four famous battles had been fought,—Edge Hill, Newbury, Nantwich, and Marston Moor. The Puritan cannon had battered down many an ancient castle of the nobility. The king's cause was lost, and the successful Puritan and parliamentary soldiers, with their extraordinary biblical names,—Praise God Barebones and Sergeant Hew Agag in Pieces before the Lord,—were roaming through the country, smashing the images in the churches, tearing out the pipes in the organs, breaking the stained-glass windows, and stabling their horses in cathedrals.

But although civil war rages in a country the ordinary affairs of life go on. The children play hide-and-seek and lovers kiss their sweethearts as in the piping times of peace. We must not let the general statements and perspective of history deceive us, and we are assured that there was still some quiet life left in England when we read of that country gentleman

who, on the morning of the battle of Edge Hill, was unconcernedly strolling with his dogs between the two armies. What concern had the war with him whose life as lord of his lands was self-contained and complete?

So Penn, we may infer, was born as peacefully as children usually are in a house where his father and mother had lodgings, and which stood in London in a little court close to the Tower and adjoining what was called London Wall. His father had gone to sea, and soon the mother and her son left London and went to live in the pretty village of Wanstead, near Essex, and there Penn passed his boyhood and went to school.

III

ADMIRAL PENN

Of Penn's mother very little is known, except that she was a Dutch woman, the daughter of John Jasper, a merchant of Rotterdam. Her son has left us no description of her. There is no portrait, no anecdotes or sayings, nothing that would reveal her character; and very likely she was a plain, mediocre person; for if she had been otherwise, something more definite about her would have come down to us.

Penn showed few if any Dutch traits. We might expect that his mother would have given him some of the thrifty, economical qualities of her nation. But he was just the reverse, a lavish spender of money rather than a saver, and a very poor business man, so far as regards details and management. His ideas of such subjects were grand, general, and sweeping like an Englishman's, in advance of his time and greater than his ability could accomplish. It might be said that his very earnest and advanced opinions on the subject of religious liberty were Dutch; but he might have gained such opinions from the Quakers, who supported them more ardently than any other sect.

Pepys describes in his diary, in his amusing way,

his first meeting Lady Penn in August, 1664, and her appearance.

"At noon dined at home and after dinner my wife and I to Sir W Pen's to see his lady, the first time, who is a well looked, fat short old Dutch woman, but one that hath been heretofore pretty handsome, and is now very discreet and I believe hath more wit than her husband. Here we stayed talking a good while and very well pleased I was with the old woman at first visit." (Vol. iv. p. 207.)

In another passage he describes Lady Penn and some of the manners of the times when people visited one another in their bedrooms.

"So home vexed and going to my Lady Batten's there found a great many women with her in her chamber merry, my Lady Pen and her daughter, among others; where my Lady Pen flung me down upon the bed, and herself and others, one after another, upon me, and very merry we were." (Vol. iv. pp. 391, 392.)

Later on Pepys describes her as "mighty homely and looks old." She was sufficiently good-looking, however, for him to make love to her.

She and her husband were, no doubt, plain people, and when they married were in moderate circumstances. The biographers describe Penn's birthplace near the Tower, as if his parents occupied the whole house; but it seems they only lodged there. Pepys, who for many years associated with them very intimately, gives us an account of their beginnings; but he obtained it from a certain Mrs. Turner, who was evidently an atrocious gossip.

"She [Mrs. Turner] says that he was a pityfull [fellow] when she first knew them; that his lady was one of the sourest, dirty women, that ever she saw; that they took two chambers, one over another, for themselves and child in Tower Hill; that for many years together

they eat more meals at her house than at their own . . . that she brought my lady who then was a dirty slattern with her stockings hanging about her heels so that afterwards the people of the whole Hill did say that Mrs Turner had made Mrs Pen a gentlewoman." (Vol. vi. p. 329.)

But after making full allowances for Mrs. Turner, we can readily understand that there was a foundation of truth for what she said. Admiral Penn also, though of a respectable family, was a rough man. He was brought up as a sailor, and at the time he married and took lodgings near the Tower he had only lately come out of the merchant service, a very rough and brutal school. Lord Clarendon, as we shall see, described him as a man who was always trying to put on the appearance of good breeding, and not always with success. His whole career shows that, starting with almost nothing, he had a consuming ambition to make a fortune and get into good society without being over-scrupulous as to the means he used.

He is described on his tomb as descended from the Penns of Penns-Lodge, in the County of Wilts, and also from the Penns of Penn, in the County of Bucks. The family had apparently lived in those places from time immemorial, and that is all we know about them with any certainty. One of the ancestors is said to have been a monk in the Abbey of Glastonbury, in Somersetshire. When the monasteries were dissolved in the beginning of the reformation by Henry VIII., this monk was granted some of the Abbey lands, where he established Penns-Lodge, married, and had several children. It is possible

that from this man William Penn may have inherited his strong religious inclinations.

Several traditions attempt to trace back still farther the family history. Penn himself believed that he was of Welsh origin; and according to Watson's "Annals of Pennsylvania," * the Rev. Hugh David, who went to Philadelphia in 1700, relates that he and Penn were on the ship together, when Penn, seeing a goat gnawing a broom, said,—

"Hugh, dost thou observe that goat? See what hardy fellows the Welsh are, how they can feed on a broom. However, Hugh, I am a Welshman myself, and will relate by how strange a circumstance our family lost their name. My grandfather (or great-grandfather) was named John Tudor, and lived upon the top of a hill or mountain in Wales; he was generally called John Penmunrith which in English is 'John on the top of a hill.' He removed from Wales into Ireland, where he acquired considerable property. Upon his return into his own country, he was addressed by his old friends and neighbors, not in the former way, but by the name of Mr. Penn. He afterwards removed to London, where he continued to reside under the name of John Penn, which has since been the family name."

Some of the details of this statement are not consistent with the rest of the family history; and in a letter written by Penn's son, John Penn, to the Rev. Dr. Smith, of Philadelphia, still another origin is suggested. It seems some woman in France named De Penn, or possibly De la Penne, had written to the Penns in England, claiming relationship with them. Some of her family, she said, had gone to England with William the Conqueror. This origin, seeming to be more flattering to the family pride, has been adopted by some writers; but there is no

* Vol. i. p. 119.

proof of its correctness. Of the two, the Welsh origin is the more likely to be the true one.

But for our purpose we need go no farther back than Giles Penn, the grandfather of William Penn. The family appear to have lived in Bucks and Wilts as respectable people of some means, belonging to the country gentry. But we must not think of the country gentleman of that time as anything like what he has been during the last century in England. He was a very rough farmer, leading a life of rude plenty, not on a country-seat with trim lawns and gardens, but on rugged acres, with his cattle and chickens of first importance, and allowed to wander under his bedroom windows. Instead of the excellent education, foreign travel, and familiarity with London for a few months every year, which characterize the squire of modern times, he seldom saw London more than once in his lifetime, he had never travelled, and his education was usually of the poorest. He was an aristocrat only because he held the political power in his county, presiding as a magistrate, and commanding the trainbands. In other respects his manners as well as his life were rude and boorish.

Whatever position the Penn family had they seem to have been unable to support towards the close of the sixteenth century, for the ancestral farm, Penns-Lodge, passed out of their hands, and we find that Giles Penn took to a seafaring life.

Commerce and shipping gave good opportunities in those days for making a fortune ; and Giles Penn no doubt was anxious to restore his family position,

and even to make it better than it had been. But the greatest opportunities for fortune-making came to the men who were courtiers, office-holders, or officers in the army or navy. The salaries of the courtiers who held office seem very large for the times; but the perquisites and opportunities under the system of corruption which prevailed were enormous. The population of England was then considerably less than five million, and the population of London not half a million; but the office of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, for example, was supposed to be worth forty thousand pounds a year; and from this high official down to the lowest clerk, tide-waiter, or gauger, the same methods of gross corruption gave opportunities which varied only in degree.

Next in importance after the court officials for their opportunities for making money were the naval officers. Corruption and peculation were, if anything, more rife in the navy than at court; and war-vessels were constantly employed to carry from port to port bullion and other valuable cargoes which merchants dared not trust to ordinary vessels. In this service naval captains, being in a position to demand large rewards, often made several thousand pounds by a short voyage.

The merchant marine was closely connected with the navy, for merchant ships were usually armed, carrying sometimes thirty or forty guns, and were often taken into the navy in large numbers to assist the public war-vessels. A training in the merchant service gave opportunities for entering the navy.

Giles Penn secured the release of some captives held by the Selee rovers, as the pirates of Algiers were then called, and for this service he was to have been made vice-admiral of a fleet to be fitted out to punish the Algerines. He never received his commission, however; but instead of it was made consul to the Mediterranean ports.

He failed to enjoy the lucrative opportunities of the navy, but he was determined that his son, the father of William Penn, should enjoy all that the navy had to bestow. He trained the boy most carefully on his own ship in the practice and theory of navigation, and the youth entered the navy of King Charles I. before he was twenty, and was at once given the rank of lieutenant. When he was twenty-one years old, in 1642, he was made a captain. He almost immediately married, and within a little over a year his famous son William was born.

So William Penn was the son of a very young man, almost a boy, but in command of the "Fellowship" of twenty-eight guns, with orders to join the fleet of Admiral Swanley in the Irish seas. Two years afterwards the father was made Rear-Admiral of Ireland; in 1646 he was given command of a squadron as Vice-Admiral of Ireland, and by the time he was thirty-one he was Vice-Admiral of England.

This seems nowadays most ridiculously rapid advancement, and in lives of the admiral and also in lives of William Penn it is described in a way to give the impression that this youth must have been a naval prodigy. But in the condition of affairs at

that time a man rose in the navy very rapidly, indeed almost instantly, under certain circumstances, so that such a thing as a boy admiral was not altogether impossible.

Clowes, in his "History of the British Navy," has described what a man-of-war was in those days. It was a beautiful creation of art, carved from stem to stern with a richness of curves and tracery which is the wonder and despair of modern eyes. It was more beautiful, indeed, than serviceable, and it is no exaggeration to say that within it was very often, so far as the crew were concerned, a floating hell and pest-house.

The sailors were wretched criminal creatures, collected largely by the press-gang, so ill paid and so seldom paid that they were continually in mutiny, and so ill fed that they were continually robbing and marauding for food. A mob of them once threatened to besiege the court at White Hall, and actually seized the Guild Hall at Plymouth. The sick were turned ashore starving, and the rapid mortality on many of the ships from disease and dirt was frightful. They were punished for bad conduct by ducking, keel-hauling, tongue-scraping, flogging, dragging through the water at the stern of a row-boat, tying up with weights about the neck, and a sailor that slept four times on watch was lashed to the bowsprit and left there to starve to death or drown.

The officers who commanded them were more fortunate, and led a sumptuous, jovial life. Pepys, when with the fleet that brought back Charles II.

from Holland, describes how they spent the afternoon in playing nine-pins on the quarter deck, with a grand dinner in the evening, followed by music and heavy drinking, which sent every one to bed quite mellow. The captains and officers had their mistresses on board, or, as some accounts put it, their harems, and there were also abandoned women allowed among the crew.

Many of the officers in highest command, the captains and admirals, were landsmen without special training, and they bought and sold their commands and indulged in unlimited corruption and peculation.

"The dock-yard officials robbed wholesale; the captains turned their ships into cargo-boats for their own profit, and conspired with the pursers to forge and sell seamen's tickets; carpenters, gunners, boatswains, and pursers cheated and swindled; imaginary men were borne in nearly all ships, and their wages were shared among the officers; and government store-houses were converted into surreptitious residences for government servants and their families." (Clowes's "Royal Navy," vol. ii. p. 19.)

Military men entered the navy as freely as landsmen. At that time, and, indeed, in all the previous history of the world, there was no complete separation between the naval and military departments of a nation. In ancient times Pompey and Agrippa commanded forces both on sea and land. Lord Howard, who commanded the British fleet that defeated the Spanish Armada, was a landsman. Sir Walter Raleigh was both an admiral and a general.

In Penn's time the best admirals, except himself, were landsmen, and naval captains were often spoken

of as colonels. Blake, who was the greatest of them, and who, indeed, is usually considered one of the two or three greatest admirals that Britain has produced, was a soldier, and never went to sea until he was fifty years old. Prince Rupert, who commanded the cavalry of Charles I., also commanded a fleet. Dean and Montagu, of that time, were also military men. General Monk, who restored Charles II. to the throne, also took his turn on the sea. It was he who, when he wanted his ship turned to the port side, aroused the amusement of his crew by giving the order, "Left wheel!"

The reason why military men succeeded so well in command of fleets would seem to be that the navy had few, if any, regularly trained officers who could be raised to positions of large responsibility. Those who had a knowledge of seamanship were mostly mere tarpaulins, with neither education, manners, nor honesty. They had risen from the forecastle, and many of them had been captains of privateers, an occupation which did not improve their morals. There were some exceptions to this rule. Sir Christopher Mings, Sir John Narborough, and Sir Cloudsley Shovel had begun life as cabin-boys. But for the most part men of this sort were valuable only for certain purposes within a limited sphere. They were incapable of forming comprehensive plans or dealing with complicated situations, and they were compelled to yield the important commands to military men of wider attainments and more general education and experience.

Penn rose to be an admiral at twenty-three for the

reason apparently that he was a rare instance of a man with practical sea experience, who also had enough education and breadth of mind to take the responsibility of a large command. At heart he was a Royalist and preferred the king's cause; but his rapid promotions were received from Parliament and Cromwell. The army had gone over to the king and the navy had taken the side of Parliament. The crews, which had been starved and tortured under the king, thought they saw brighter prospects in the popular cause. They went over in large numbers, and Penn went with them. He was determined to rise in his profession, whatever flag he fought under, and he rightly judged that the popular and parliamentary cause would, for a time at least, be successful. He commanded the squadron that met with such ill success in its operations on the Irish coast; but the failure was through no fault of his. He distinguished himself, and the Parliament voted him their thanks for his "courage and fidelity."

Soon afterwards he was put under arrest, apparently because he was suspected of having, as, indeed, he had, a secret interest in the king's cause. He was released, however, soon promoted, and it was not long before he commanded the squadron which went in pursuit of the ships of that gallant landsman, Prince Rupert. But, although Penn followed him through the English Channel and even into the Mediterranean, the cavalryman eluded the trained sailor on his own element.

Penn's greatest service now followed in the naval

war which Cromwell waged for two years with Holland. The Dutch, thinking they could wrest from the English the empire of the sea, refused to follow the ancient custom by which all ships had for ages saluted the British flag. This honor of the flag was originally a mere courtesy in recognition of the protection English ships had always given to the traders of all nations. But British men-of-war had now for a long time demanded it as a right and an insignia of their country's supremacy on the ocean. It was under this same principle of supremacy that they claimed the right of search which brought on the war of the United States with England in 1812.

In the three terrible battles of the Dutch war, in which more than a hundred ships were engaged on each side, Penn greatly distinguished himself. In the second battle the Dutch Admiral Tromp grappled Penn's ship, and boarded him. Penn's sailors repulsed the attack, followed the enemy on to their own ship, and drove them below the hatches, where, with reckless courage, they exploded part of their powder, blowing their decks, with the English on them, into the air. The survivors of Penn's crew rushed back into the Dutch ship, and Tromp would have been taken if two other admirals—De Ruyter and De Witte had not come to his rescue. For his services in this battle Penn was given the rank of general-at-sea.

The next year, 1654, he was sent by Cromwell in command of a fleet, accompanied by an army under General Venables, to capture as many as possible of the Spanish West Indian islands. And now a strange

thing happened, which disclosed Admiral Penn's character and had a most important bearing on the career of his son. Both the admiral and General Venables secretly sent word to Charles II., then living in exile on the continent, that if he wished it, they would turn over the fleet and army to him.

Charles thanked them, but declined their assistance, because he had no place to keep either a fleet or an army. But he would, he said, remember their offer; and neither he nor his brother and successor, James II., ever forgot it. The fortune of Admiral Penn and of his son William was made by this act. Through the royal favor which flowed from it for the next fifty years William Penn delivered Quakers from prison, led the life of a successful courtier, and received the grant of the vast territory of Pennsylvania. Yet it was an act which cannot be regarded now in any other light than that of dishonorable treachery.

Cromwell and the parliamentary party had made Admiral Penn all that he was, had given him his rapid promotion, his estates in Ireland, and raised him to the important command which made his offer of the fleet seem a thing of great value in the eyes of Charles II. and his brother. It was common enough all through the civil war for men in the employ of Parliament to correspond secretly with the exiled king. Some of these were sincerely devoted to the king's cause; but most of them were merely putting out an anchor to windward in case the king should return. Penn went farther than any of them, and overstepped all bounds. He, no doubt, saw

that the parliamentary cause was gradually waning, and he was determined that his anchor to windward should be the largest and most powerful of all.

At that time, however, professional honor was unknown in the British navy, and, brought up in the midst of all kinds of official corruption and the moral looseness of the civil war, it is not likely that Admiral Penn's conscience was seriously troubled. Anxious he must have been for the outcome of such a daring and dangerous move; but the end showed that he had calculated with the most perfect shrewdness and cunning.*

It has been supposed that Cromwell knew at once of this offer of the fleet and army to Charles; but, cool and sagacious as he always was, he said nothing, made no move, and doubtless laughed with grim Puritan humor when he heard that the offer had been rejected. This is highly probable; for he spent, it is said, sixty thousand pounds annually in maintaining spies at the court of Charles, and if he did not know of the offer at once, it seems quite certain that he soon heard of it. He knew, no doubt, that the offer must necessarily be refused, and that Penn was merely placing his great anchor to windward for future contingencies. So he allowed

* His son William, with amusing vagueness, has attempted to explain his father's double service to both Cromwell and the king: "'Tis true, he was actually engaged both under the Parliament and king, but not as an actor in our late domestic troubles; his compass always steering him to eye a national concern and not intestine wars, and therefore not so aptly theirs [the Parliament's] in a way of opposition as the nation's."—Granville Penn's Memorials of Sir William Penn, vol. ii. p. 569.

the expedition to go on as it had been planned, well knowing that Penn's professional pride would compel him to do his best.

The expedition failed utterly against San Domingo, but not from any fault of Penn, for the army, which was hopelessly inefficient, alone took part in the attack. In the attack on Jamaica both army and fleet acted together; the island fell into their hands without a struggle, and is still a British colony.

As soon as Admiral Penn returned to England he was committed to the Tower on the charge of coming home without leave. But that was evidently not the real reason. Cromwell shrewdly judged that he had obtained from him all the service that was possible or safe. He was ordered to confess his fault, surrender his commission as general-at-sea, and make his submission to the Lord Protector. When he had done all this, he was set free both from prison and from the navy. He was rendered as harmless as possible short of putting him to death or imprisoning him for life, which would not have been politic. He retired to Ireland to the estates that had been given him for his services by Cromwell, and there waited and in a mild way plotted for the restoration of the king.

On the eve of the restoration he was summoned from his retirement to represent in Parliament the town of Weymouth, and he hurried to Holland to be the bearer of the glad tidings to Charles. He was immediately knighted, made commissioner of admiralty, and governor of Kinsale. His Irish estates were given back to their royalist owner from

whom Cromwell had taken them, and in place of them other estates in Ireland were given to Penn.

He had achieved a large part of his ambition, which was to make a fortune, become a courtier, associate with noblemen, and perhaps become one. Henceforth his life was passed in the court circles, for that alone could satisfy him. He was at heart an intensely ardent Royalist and aristocrat, and although he had aided the Cromwellian and parliamentary cause, he had in the end used it most cleverly to advance his own royalist interests.

The king and his brother James, Duke of York, bound Penn closely to themselves. The duke became Lord High Admiral, and took Penn into his personal service. In the campaign against the Dutch, in 1665, Penn, with the title great captain commander, was on the duke's ship as his confidential adviser, for the duke was a landsman; and in this relation, in which he practically commanded the fleet, Penn took part in the famous and decisive battle against the Dutch admiral, Opdam.

This was the last of Penn's sea service. He was only about forty-five years old; but his health was already broken by severe attacks of the gout, and he died in 1670, before he was fifty. He was rather young to have the gout so badly; but he was, it seems, a heavy drinker, and probably also a heavy eater after the manner of those times.

"In the evening at Sir W. Pen's with my wife at supper: he in a mad ridiculous, drunken humour; and it seems there have been some late distances between his lady and him as my [wife] tells me." ("Pepys Diary," vol. v. p. 434.)

ADMIRAL PENN

"Sir W Pen half drunk did talk like a fool and vex his wife." (Vol. vi. pp. 330, 331.)

The portrait of Admiral Penn at the age of forty-five, painted by Sir Peter Lely, is a most interesting picture, and shows a handsome, but not a dissipated face. The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, however, possesses a portrait of him, of uncertain authenticity, with a large, bloated nose, fully justifying Pepys's description.

The best that Pepys has to say of him is that he was "a very sociable man and an able man and very cunning." But his rise, Pepys assures us, was due to large bribes and all sorts of irregular practices. By this means he became general-at-sea under Cromwell, and by the same means got himself out of the Tower in Cromwell's time. In the civil war, Pepys says, he was a devilish plunderer, and by that means got his estates in Ireland. In fact, Pepys is never tired of calling him a false fellow and a rogue, and describing the "sluttishness of his family." *

It should be remembered, however, that Pepys was also enriching himself while in the service of the Admiralty by every opportunity; and no doubt Penn interfered with many of his schemes. Pepys's hatred of him, and yet continual association with him, is amusing at times, especially when Pepys is disgusted at the bad dinners he gets at Penn's house and complains that when he gives Penn a dinner the stupid sailor is unable to appreciate it. Pepys's

* Vol. vi. pp. 330, 331; vol. vii. p. 100.

morals were bad, and he was intriguing with the wives of many of his acquaintances. In weighing what he says, we must remember that by his own statement he attempted familiarities with Admiral Penn's wife, and also had designs on his daughter.

Lord Clarendon, who knew Penn well, has also left us a description of him:

> "Penn, who had much the worse understanding, had a great mind to appear better bred and to speak like a gentleman; he had got many good words which he used at adventure; he was a formal man and spake very leisurely, but much, and left the matter more intricate and perplexed than he found it." (Vol. ii. p. 354.)

But I cannot give the whole life of the admiral. I have dwelt on many of the details of it principally to show what a strong hold he secured on the affections of Charles II. and the Duke of York, for this was the foundation of his son's career. After his service against Opdam the duke wanted him to take another command at sea; and when Penn declined, insisted on his acceptance. But military men were now in control of the navy, and they were very jealous of regular sailors like Penn. They had him impeached for helping himself too liberally to the silk, spices, and jewels on board some rich prizes that had been taken from the Dutch. He does not appear to have been guilty; but the impeachment proceedings effectually blocked his appointment until it was too late for him to go to sea, and then the prosecution was dropped.

The king, anxious to reward him, was about to raise him to the peerage under the title of Viscount Weymouth; but his son William had by this time

become a Quaker and was protesting loudly against all titles as vanities of the flesh. It seemed ridiculous to give a title that would descend to such a strange fanatic, and the king's good intentions were checked. So the admiral, through his nuisance of a son, failed to attain what was, no doubt, one of the chief objects of his ambition. But he had picked up in one way or another a considerable fortune, which he left to the deluded boy; and, most important of all, he left him the extreme good-will and affection of Charles II. and the Duke of York, who became James II.

He had lent to the crown various sums of money, and these at the time of his death, with the arrears of his pay, amounted to over twelve thousand pounds. Eleven years afterwards the debt, with interest, had grown to sixteen thousand pounds, and was liquidated by the grant to the son of the province of Pennsylvania.

IV

EARLY INFLUENCES

DURING all of Admiral Penn's service for Cromwell and the Parliament his son William remained with his Dutch mother at Wanstead, living quietly while the battle of Naseby was fought and Bridgewater and Bristol stormed, and the unfortunate King Charles beheaded in 1649. Penn was only five years old in 1649, and up to that time public events could not have made much impression on him. The foundation of his opinions inherited from his father was royalist, and his close relations with King Charles and King James afterwards made him still more of a Royalist. But the principles of the opposite party—the principles of liberty and free government—also made a deep impression on him, and he was, as we shall see, a curious mixture of the two political parties. His liberal ideas seem to have been imbibed in his early youth at Wanstead, when his father was away for years and never saw him. He heard a great deal there about civil liberty and the rights of Parliament, and during the subsequent six or seven years, as he became more impressionable, he continued to hear the same principles.

A new era began with the death of King Charles. In fact, a new England was created. Parliamentary

government and national consent, as against monarchy and despotism, got a surer foothold than they had ever had before, a foothold which they struggled to keep until the boy William Penn lived to see them, much to his surprise, securely and permanently established by William III. in 1688.

He lived at Wanstead until he was twelve years old, and during that time saw little or nothing of his father the admiral, who sailed to join the fleet on the Irish coast two days before his son was born, and after that was in continuous sea employment until he returned from the taking of Jamaica.

The boy went to school at Wanstead, and seems to have received the regular training in Latin, Greek, and mathematics which was given at that time. Wanstead and the village of Chigwell near by were pretty places, with all the advantages of country life and amusements. Penn was afterwards at college fond of athletic sports, and he doubtless laid the foundation for this taste in the fields and woods of his country home.

This same country neighborhood was intensely Puritan, and this seems to have had an important influence on the future Quaker leader. It no doubt modified his inherited royalist opinions, and it is not unlikely that during those twelve years he unconsciously received from his surroundings that tinge of thought which led to Quakerism. Puritans were in the habit of discussing religious subjects day and night; and the burden of all that the boy heard would be rejection of forms and ceremonies and more or less reliance on the individual judgment.

The Quakers carried individual judgment farther than the Puritans, but the Puritan state of mind was a natural foundation for Quakerism. There was no sect that the Puritans despised so much as they despised the Quakers; but, unconsciously, they had made easier the path to Quakerism.

We are confirmed in this view by learning that, when he was only eleven years old, Penn, when alone one day in his room, had a religious experience, as it is called.

> "He was suddenly surprised with an inward comfort; and, as he thought, an external glory in the room, which gave rise to religious emotions, during which he had the strongest conviction of the being of God, and that the soul of man was capable of enjoying communication with Him. He believed also that the seal of divinity had been put upon him at this moment, or that he had been awakened or called upon to a holy life."

The teaching of the Church of England at that time would not have led a boy to such an experience; but emotionalism of that sort was an almost every-day experience among the Puritans, and he had, no doubt, heard many edifying accounts of it. Indeed, it is impossible to find in Penn during his youth any trace of Church of England teaching. His bent was radically the other way; and it is highly probable that it was started by the influences at Wanstead.

This was unfortunate for his father, the admiral, whose aristocratic tastes and ambition for a peerage led him to see nothing but folly in any deviation from the religion of the crown and the court. The great object of his life had been to restore the for-

tunes of his family and advance their position; and he could not see a way to this end for his son through Puritan cant and emotionalism. If he had been at home during those first twelve years of his son's life, he might have seen and counteracted the dangerous influence. But he was away, and was now to reap bitter fruit from that absence.

When the admiral, on his return from Jamaica, was put in the Tower by Cromwell, his wife and son left Wanstead and came to live where the son had been born, in the little court close to the Tower. But the admiral, on his release, went to his estates in Ireland, and was again separated from his son. After the Restoration they saw more of each other; but then it was too late, and at no time had the father any sufficient opportunity to exert such an influence as would shape the boy as he wished him to be.

In October, 1660, when he was sixteen years old, Penn was sent to Christ Church College, at Oxford. Christ Church had always been largely the college of the aristocracy, and the foster mother of some very famous men. Besides Penn, we find among the alumni, Locke, the philosopher; South, the famous preacher; Liddell, Liddon, Pusey, Gladstone, Goldwin Smith, the present Prince of Wales, Lord Dufferin, Lord Salisbury, a host of minor diplomats and statesmen, and the historians Gardiner and Stubbs.

Penn was entered as a gentleman commoner, and matriculated as a knight's son. The selection of the college was evidently part of the admiral's design of pushing on his son towards preferment and a high

career, fitting him for the position of a nobleman and a courtier. At college he would acquire the manners and tastes of a gentleman, and make the acquaintance of the aristocracy; and afterwards the admiral's influence at court would secure for him office, advancement, and those irregular opportunities for making a great fortune.

But Oxford at that time was not altogether well suited to accomplish an object of that kind. For many years it had been under the influence of the Puritans. Before the civil war they had railed at both the universities as "nurseries of wickedness, nests of mutton tuggers, dens of formal droanes, and cages of unclean birds." When the success of the parliamentary forces let the Puritans into power, they proceeded to make the universities what they thought they should be. Honest old Anthony Wood tells us in his diary how unpleasantly they impressed him. They were factious, saucy, conceited, morose, and delighted in plots, he says. They affected temperance, but tippled privately in their own rooms and crept into taverns at the back door. They protested against cavalier cursing and swaggering, but were themselves sneaking, tale-bearing, and jealous.

Penn arrived in Oxford in the year of the restoration, when the influence of the Church of England had been restored, or rather had been ordered to be restored. The organ of Magdalen College, which Cromwell had taken for his own private use at Hampton Court, was brought back; the other organs which had been removed from college chapels were

returned; the surplice was once more worn at the services, and the prayer-book took the place of the extemporaneous efforts of Puritan ministers. At all this, Wood tells us, the Puritans "whined and made ugly faces;" they ridiculed the surplice and the prayer-book, and compared the organs to the squealing of pigs.

Such a strong influence as Puritanism had been could not be wiped out of Oxford in a few months. The Puritan clergy and dons could not be all dismissed at once. Many of them merely conformed outwardly to the changed times, and we should naturally expect that Puritanism would lurk for a long time in the corridors and secret corners of the ancient architecture which Puritanism affected to despise.

The churchmen did all they could to suppress it and build up the royal party. They encouraged the Sunday amusements which the Puritans had abolished; they stopped the old Puritan custom of taking notes of sermons and repeating sermons at home, and the singing of psalms after supper. They allowed people to loiter in the streets, sit on benches, walk in the fields, or drink in the taverns on Sunday, all of which had only a short time before been accounted most damnable practices. They encouraged May games, morrises, revels, and plays, and they did all these things in excess because the Puritans hated them. A great deal of the extravagance of the cavalier character, the excessive swearing and swaggering, the reckless devotion to amusements, and the delivery of mock sermons, was a reaction from the

opposite extreme of the Puritans, and assumed out of mere hatred for the malignants who had murdered the king.

Young William Penn, thrown suddenly among such strange conflicts in college life, seems to have revolted from the vicious part of these cavalier habits. But, unfortunately, we have scarcely any details of him at this time, and are left to inferences. He afterwards spoke of having while in college been sustained by God "in the midst of that hellish darkness and debauchery."

The efforts of the churchmen, Wood tells us, had their effect on many of the Puritans, and he gives most amusing descriptions of how they would cringe for preferment, and say that they were sorry that they had formerly allowed themselves to go with the times; they had all along been at heart with the royal party, but were afraid to avow it. They began to frequent the taverns openly; they stripped off their puritanical clothes, and would "put on cassocks reaching to their heels, tied close with a sanctified circingle." They had hated a square cap; now they could not dispense with one. Those who had for years been wearing the demure face of a saint now assumed a "wanton countenance," and would utter "a pretty little oath." They would make "long legs and scrapes" to Royalists, and turn informer against their own people.*

The king's brother, Henry, Duke of Gloucester, had died of the small-pox only about a month before

* Wood's Diary (ed. of 1891), pp. 293, 359, 360, 366, etc.

Penn arrived in Oxford, and the nation, now enthusiastically royalist, went into mourning for him. The university also assumed the royalist tone, and published a volume of verses, entitled "Threnodia," on the young duke's death, and Penn contributed to this volume some Latin lines. From this we may infer that the young man was royalist in his sympathies, or trying to be. He often afterwards showed royalist feelings, so far as politics were concerned; but in religion he was on the Puritan side at Oxford.

He sympathized, it seems, with the Puritan protests against the changes at Oxford,—the surplices, the revels, and recklessness. There seem to have been several open rebellions against the surplice. One night Puritan students collected all of these abhorrent vestments they could find and dumped them into a vile cesspool, punching them down with sticks. From this defilement they were rescued by the authorities, and that and the subsequent cleaning of them was thought to be a grand joke. Wood gives the details of the escapade and also some verses of the time, which could not now by any possibility be printed. There is no evidence that Penn was connected with this particular affair; but, as we shall see hereafter, he was concerned with some religious protests, probably against the surplices, for which he was expelled from college.

It would seem as if his father had not chosen wisely in sending him to Christ Church. But Puritanism lurked in all the English colleges, and the lad, in spite of his siding with the Puritan feeling, took kindly to many of those arts which would make

him the sort of man his father wanted him to be. He was fond of athletic sports, and became proficient in them ; but, unfortunately, in this, as in other parts of his youthful career, we have no details of his efforts or success. From what we know of his writings and subsequent career, he must have studied fairly well, like a gentleman, and not like a bookworm or recluse. He seemed safe enough, and he was in reality safe from Puritanism ; but he was suddenly caught by another ism that was abroad in those days, and in his father's eyes more abhorrent, degrading, and unfortunate than even Puritanism could be.

V

THE QUAKERS

THE Quakers, or Friends, as they preferred to be called, were a very peculiar people both in their origin and in their belief, and when Penn was a young man at college they had been in existence as a distinct sect only about ten years. They were making terrible trouble and commotion in England. Large numbers of them were refusing to pay the tithes or taxes which every one was bound by law to pay for the support of the Established Church. They wrote books and pamphlets ridiculing the tax, and steadily refused to pay it, until the sheriff was obliged to seize their property and sell it for treble the amount of the tax, or imprison them. Their resistance to this tax seemed to those in authority but little short of open rebellion and an encouragement to riot and disorder.

They disturbed the administration of justice by refusing to take an oath in court or to be sworn on an affidavit. The Scriptures, they said, had commanded, "Swear not at all," and oaths were a blasphemous as well as a useless means of compelling truthful statements. They persisted also in wearing their hats in court-rooms and in the presence of important persons. Hats were then worn in church, the clergy preached in them, they were worn at

dinner, and, as a rule, more generally than in modern times. Thus the few occasions when they were taken off were more distinctly occasions of respect. A son must always uncover before his father, every one uncovered before the king, and ordinary persons seem to have uncovered before the nobility. But the Quaker hat remained unmoved on these occasions. They uncovered, they said, only in prayer as an act of worship, and it would be a dishonor to their Maker to treat men in the same manner.

They refused to address any one by his title or rank ; they would not even use the title mister ; and bluntly called every one by his first name. They also addressed every one indiscriminately as thee and thou because the use of the plural you had originated, they said, in the vanity of compliment. Thee and thou were used at that time only to servants and inferiors ; and no other Quaker peculiarity seems to have given so much offence as this one. Penn describes the indignation with which people would turn on a Quaker and exclaim, "Thou me, thou my dog ! If thou thou'st me, I'll thou thy teeth down thy throat." To which the Quaker would reply by asking, "Why, then, dost thou always address God in thy prayers by thee and thou ?"

Penn seems to have used the thee and thou language rather sparingly. In his private letters to acquaintances who were Quakers he of course used it freely ; and he sometimes used it to those who were not Quakers, when he was indignant or angry ; but in his important public letters he often managed

to avoid it altogether, and for the reason, no doubt, that, being an educated man, he would not give unnecessary offence.

The rest of the early Quakers, however, were mostly people of the lower orders, already rough enough in their ways, and they seemed to the upper classes of that time determined to make their religion as offensive and vulgar as possible. They preached in taverns and in the streets and fields, gathering crowds which those who disliked them said were a menace to peace and good order. They walked along the streets giving prophecies and warnings of doom in a strange monotonous voice which was a variation on the drawl of the Puritans. They trembled as they spoke, and from this, or because George Fox had bade the magistrates tremble at the word of the Lord, they were called Quakers. They went into church during service and interrupted the preacher with sharp critical comment, and were often so wild and fantastic that they broke up the congregation.

The women among them preached and took the part of men. They would keep the fasts and holy days of neither Churchman nor Puritan. They travelled on Sunday, and some of them even opened their shops on Sunday. Occasionally some of them would become almost insane, break bottles in a church as a sign, or go half naked, like Solomon Eccles, who, having stripped himself to the waist, walked through a town with a pan of fire and brimstone on his head.

In a word, judged by the standard of that time, their manners to both Churchmen and Puritans were

detestable; and when the substance of their belief was known it seemed worse than their manners.

They denied the validity of all the sacraments; not merely the numerous sacraments of the Roman church, but they denied baptism and the Lord's Supper, which were retained by the Protestants. They denied every dogma and doctrine not only of the Roman church, but of all the Protestant churches as well. They refused to accept the complicated doctrine of the Trinity as stated in the Athanasian creed. They declared that a man was not bound to believe more than his reason could comprehend. They even regarded the Scriptures differently from most Protestants; for while they admitted the validity of the Bible as a guide and comfort, they insisted that they were capable of receiving revelations in addition to and independent of it.

They protested against original sin and the whole system of doctrine by which it was believed to be impossible for man to be anything but a sinner; and in place of it they announced their belief in the possibility of human perfection on earth. This was a bold doctrine, lifting at once that vast burden which had weighed down so many human hearts, but it brought them the most intense hatred and contempt of both Catholics and Protestants.

They protested against all clergymen and preachers who received a reward for their services, calling them a hireling ministry. Their own preachers were unpaid, and they protested against higher education and learning, which, they said, was a hinderance to any one who wished to preach the religion of Christ.

They called churches "priest-houses" or "steeple-houses;" and they objected to the use of the word church as applied to a building or a corporate body. The church of Christ was in their minds a purely spiritual conception or spiritual body, if such a term can be used.

They appeared to have only one important doctrine that was not negative, and that was their belief in what they called the inward light, which had been given by Christ to every one who came into the world, and was sufficient to guide him to all truth and save his soul without the aid of ceremonies, dogmas, priests, or churches. This light was not to be confounded with conscience, which was a natural quality of human nature, and existed in Adam before the fall. The inward light was in addition to conscience and intended to enlighten and assist it.

Their worship was formless, or rather formal in its formlessness. They sat silent in their meetings until some one was moved by the Spirit to pray or preach, and it was possible for a meeting to be conducted in entire silence from beginning to end. By this silent contemplation they cultivated the inward light and developed its growth and power in the soul. Two friends might hold in this way a silent meeting together. Serenity, contemplation, and quietude were, therefore, essentials of their belief, for without them there could be no spiritual growth.

They accordingly became opposed to everything that disturbed this habit of quietude. They prohibited among their members all games and amuse-

ments, theatres, cards, balls, sports, and hazardous or exciting enterprises; and as one of the most exciting occupations followed by men is politics and political discussion the Quakers as a class kept out of political life. An exception had to be made to this rule in Pennsylvania, where they were in control of the government, and there have been striking exceptions in the case of distinguished individuals, like John Bright, who in our own time has been so eminent in modern British politics. William Penn cannot be said to have abstained from this form of mental disturbance, and, indeed, George Fox himself and many of those Quakers who were imprisoned for preaching their faith, seem to have led rather exciting lives. But as a sect they were very much inclined to retire within themselves and live to themselves, a habit which did not increase their popularity.

Nor were they raised in the popular esteem of that age by their strenuous opposition to war as unchristian and their refusal to serve as soldiers. They were also very ardent believers in religious liberty; indeed, it may be said that they were almost the only sincere advocates of it at that time; but it was a doctrine by which no very great favor could be gained from either Churchman or Puritan.

Nor was their leader and organizer, George Fox, the sort of man who would be at all pleasing to conservative people. He had scarcely any education, being barely able to read and write. His father was a weaver, and he himself, when a boy, was employed to herd sheep. But he was a strong character, with

boundless courage and an elemental vigor and energy which carried him over every obstacle.

When only nineteen years old the religious unrest of the time seized upon his untamable spirit. He walked up and down his bedroom or wandered in the woods and fields full of the religious melancholy of the age, and wrestling with the strange wonderful thoughts which the Reformation had set afloat in the world. He consulted the clergy of the Established Church and the Puritan ministers, but they failed to satisfy him. They no doubt thought he was crazy, for one told him to smoke tobacco and sing psalms, and another advised him to go and have some blood let. Like many others, he became convinced that all forms of religion were corrupted and worthless. He wandered over the country and went to London, but found "all was dark and under the chain of darkness." He was in great trouble and distress of mind, with occasional reactions towards extreme happiness.

"I fasted much," he says, "walked abroad in solitary places many days, and often took my Bible, and sat in hollow trees and lonesome places till night came on; and frequently in the night walked mournfully about by myself; for I was a man of sorrows in the time of the first workings of the Lord in me. . . . Though my exercises and troubles were very great, yet were they not so continued but that I had some intermissions, and was sometimes brought into such a heavenly joy, that I thought I had been in Abraham's bosom." (Journal, p. 6.)

These inward torturings of the spirit, with violent reactions from joy to gloom, were every-day occurrences then, and were manufacturing Cromwells, Puritans, Fifth Monarchy men, Quakers, or the enthusiasts of Massachusetts, according to the material

on which they worked. People screamed with excitement at the religious meetings in the fields, shouted, trembled, denounced themselves, and went into ecstasies over new ideas which now seem commonplace enough. "I was struck with more terror by the preaching of James Nayler," said an old Cromwellian soldier, "than I was at the battle of Dunbar." But although we find many instances of this sort in the diaries and literature of the time, it would be difficult to find another which presents such a strange picture or one so typical of the age as this great powerful-souled boy sitting in a hollow tree with his Bible on his lap, and out of the wild mystic thoughts that were floating through his uneducated brain founding a new religion.

He was only twenty-two when, among other strange thoughts, it suddenly occurred to him in his wanderings that human learning, the education of Oxford and Cambridge, was not a proper qualification for a minister of Christ. It was a natural thought, for he himself had none of that sort of education. He clung to the idea, and it shows the strange condition of the times that his vigorous personality was able to force this ignorant boyish notion upon a whole sect. But the large majority of the Quakers, being of the uneducated classes, readily accepted Fox's dreams.

He was inclined to impute to himself miraculous power, as can be readily seen in his journal, where he professes to have cast out an evil spirit, healed the sick, and seen visions. He describes his visit to Litchfield in most extraordinary language.

"As I went thus crying through the streets there seemed to me a channel of blood running down the streets, and the market-place appeared a pool of blood."

Macaulay's clever phrase, that his intellect was "in the most unhappy of all states, that is to say, too much disordered for liberty and not sufficiently disordered for Bedlam," is hardly fair. In spite of his extraordinary interpretations of Scripture, he had in all practical matters great shrewdness and common sense, and so much courage and force of character that the Puritans tried to coax him to become an officer in the parliamentary army. Nor is it fair to judge him by his ungrammatical English, which had to be corrected for publication by better-educated Quakers. Not long before his time the world had been ruled for the most part by men who could barely write their names; and even to this day one cannot read Fox's Journal without feeling the wonderful power and spirit of the man, and at times the homely beauty of his words.

The movement of the time, which was revolting from dogma, got complete possession of him and swept him along. He rejected all the forms of religion he found round him. He attended those strange meetings in the fields of that excited time where Churchmen, Baptists, Presbyterians, Independents, and all manner of sects met for public discussion and the asking of puzzling, mystical questions. He spoke at these gatherings and also among the people, who discussed the same questions at fairs, markets, and public resorts.

He wandered all over England, stoned by mobs, imprisoned by magistrates, hooted at by boys, ridiculed, wondered at, respected, hated, loved. He saw the strange sects that believed that women had no souls and those who relied on dreams, many of whom became Quakers. As we read his journal we seem to live in the England of that strange age. He argued with the Ranters, who sang, whistled, and danced before him. He was in jails where he found people almost eaten to death with lice. He faced raging women who threatened to tear out his hair, lusty butchers who said they would kill him ; and one of these, who always stuck out his tongue at Quakers, had, he assures us, the tongue so swollen that he could not draw it in, and so died. The conceit with which he describes his success and everything bowing down before him would be continually amusing if we did not so often come to passages of terrible cruelty or suffering, tender pathos, strong, honest sense, and noble sentiment.

Gradually he found people of his way of thinking among those curious sects known as Familists and Seekers, until in a few years he had organized followers who were called Children of the Light, or Quakers.

So he went on arguing with clergymen in their steeple-houses, writing letters to the magistrates who imprisoned him and to mayors and officials, rebuking them in such frank language that it is no wonder he had to make himself a suit of leather clothes, the better to endure his frequent and long imprisonments.

What an unpleasant fellow he was who would go into a church and cry to the clergyman,—

"Come down, thou deceiver; dost thou bid people come freely and take of the waters of life, and yet thou takest three hundred pound a year of them." *

In another church he argued with the clergyman until the congregation drove him out, beating him with staves and throwing clods and stones at him. Nor was this the only time that he was kicked out of a church with blows or beaten and stoned as he passed through the streets. "Let us have him out of church," cried a congregation at Tickhill as they rushed upon him, and the clerk struck him over the face so violently with the Bible that the floor was covered with his blood. †

But still he turned again to face them and preach. His leather clothes and stout frame could take these things lightly, and his indomitable spirit was aroused to fresh exertions. The descriptions we have of his contests are his own, and of course he always represents himself as coming out at least morally victorious.

This strange people and their strange leader were, however, a perfectly natural product of the times, when men were revolting from the system of the Middle Ages, and were driven almost crazy by the new-found liberty of the Reformation. It is difficult now to realize what a wonderful system priestcraft had wrought, and how it had altered, or rather almost annihilated, the mental faculties, until men

* Marsh's Life of Fox, p. 86. † Ibid., p. 92.

through long disuse of their brains had become mere children.

In the Middle Ages everything had been absorbed into theology and dogma. Artists could paint only ecclesiastical pictures, and the skill of architects was devoted mainly to cathedrals. The politicians were usually priests, and every man's last will and testament had to be proved before and his estate distributed by a bishop. The domestic relations of life were entirely in the hands of the priesthood. There was scarcely any physical science, and the little there was, was referred to the theologians. If it would square with the dogmas, it was right; if it would not square with them, it was wrong. If a fact of nature was contrary to a dogma, so much the worse for nature. All reasoning was by the scholastic method, in which the dogmas of the church were taken as a starting-point from which you might reason, but to which you must return on pain of death. Independent investigation, original research, free inquiry were crimes. The dogmatic, the miraculous, and the impossible were alone important.

The dogmas had been wrought by the most cunning human ingenuity into a magnificent system. Beginning in the fourth century, when the Bishop of Rome began to claim authority as chief bishop or pope, the development went steadily on. The worship of the Virgin began. Image worship, which had been a heresy, was permitted in the seventh century. Transubstantiation, which became in the end one of the most important doctrines, had not

even a name until the eleventh century, and was not definitely decreed until 1215. So also of auricular confession, which was decreed the same year. Up to the twelfth century there were only two sacraments. After that there were seven. The celibacy of the clergy, which was unsuccessfully attempted in the fourth century, was finally made binding in the eleventh.

In addition to all this, miracles were being performed almost every day, all over Europe, at thousands of shrines and by thousands of persons, and they all had to be believed; and thousands of saints were being created which must be worshipped; and holy rags and bones and pieces of sacred wood, capable of curing disease and protecting from danger, were being multiplied without number.

Of the accompaniments of this system we can only briefly speak. The most typical, perhaps, was witchcraft, for which during the Middle Ages over nine million men and women were put to death. Other religions have been afflicted with this delusion, but no religion ever developed it to such excess as the Christianity of the Middle Ages. Over four thousand books were written on the subject, and the methods for detecting and punishing this supposed crime were as regular and as well recognized as our modern systems of police.

Of the cruelty of that religion most of us have heard. We are amazed at the organized system of the Inquisition, with its regularly appointed officials like a modern corporation or a department of government. We wonder at the men who studied the

human body and the mechanical arts for the purpose of producing the greatest amount of suffering; who invented ingenious methods of stretching and crushing the joints and tearing out the finger-nails; who wrote manuals to guide their successors in detecting the smallest theological error and inflicting the greatest amount of torture; and who followed the surest routes to agony with the same zeal with which men now build easy paths for commerce and develop steam, electricity, and surgery.

So Christianity became the most cruel as well as the most superstitious religion that has ever prevailed among men. But the cruel part of it was all perfectly logical; for those people had accepted literally and believed absolutely not only the great mass of the dogmas, but the dogma which crowned the whole and made the system complete, the doctrine of exclusive salvation. By that doctrine, unless a man believed all the other dogmas he could not be saved. If he refused to give to them the consent of his mind, he must burn forever in hell. This was the keystone of the arch, and, if it was true, every Protestant, dissenter, and heretic deserved instant death, and death would be too mild a punishment. The men who by their example and encouragement would wreck the eternal salvation of others deserved not only death, but every kind of torture: to have their entrails cut out and burnt before their eyes, to be torn asunder while alive by four horses, or anything which would make heresy terrible. In the face of an eternity of woe for millions the anguish of a few hundred counts for nothing; and

thus the Middle Ages and the Inquisition logically reasoned.

We have instances in our own time of what terrible things men and women will do when they really believe their supreme interest is threatened. As the irreconcilable conflict between the white race and the black in our country becomes more and more intense, and with rapidly increasing numbers assails more closely the white man's honor and safety, we burn negroes to death at the stake and an approving crowd stands by to watch the sizzling flesh and the agony, or applaud as strips of skin are cut from the victim, just as five hundred years ago they stood round the heretic. We resent being told that we are back in the Middle Ages. But the wicked and mistaken doctrine of putting two irreconcilable races to live together may become as frightful in its results as the mistaken doctrine of an infallible church and exclusive salvation.

We all know the story of the Reformation: how the revival of the ancient learning of Greece and Rome and the invention of the printing press pricked this vast bubble of delusion that had been inflated by the efforts of a thousand years; and then Europe seethed and boiled and rocked to and fro with the struggles of reform and fanaticism.

But it was, after all, a slow process extending over several hundred years. Even the most ardent reformers could at first get rid of only one dogma at a time. Wycliff, the first great leader of the Reformation, rejected only transubstantiation and kept pretty much all the rest. Huss, his successor, at-

tacked only the fraudulent miracles of the ecclesiastics and professed to accept all the dogmas, although he struck at the root of the whole system by declaring his belief in religious liberty. Luther, who appeared a hundred years after Huss, was equally conservative. His famous ninety-five propositions were aimed only at the sale of indulgences, which at that time was carried to great excess. He afterwards denied the authority of the Pope, which was certainly going a great way. But he clung to many dogmas which were rejected by nearly all other Protestants.

The same hesitation to break entirely and suddenly with the past was shown by all the large churches or divisions of the Reformation. The Church of England, the Lutherans, the Presbyterians, and the Independents gave up some of the dogmas, but clung to the remainder with great determination. But the numerous small and badly organized sects were always more progressive. Composed largely of lower-class people, with nothing to lose by a change and unprejudiced by education, many of them disposed at once of the whole dogmatic system, and relied entirely on their own thought and judgment, and reliance on individual conscience and judgment was the test of advancement in the Reformation.

There were a great many of these small sects in those days, with curious names long since forgotten. Familists, Seekers, Ranters, Pietists, Antinomians, Antescripturists, Enthusiasts, Soul Sleepers, Levellers, Adamites, Traskites, and Anabaptists were the more

important ones which shocked sober people by their frantic radicalism.

From the Familists, Seekers, Ranters, Baptists, and Antinomians the Quakers seem to have been largely recruited, and these sects had not a little influence in the settlement of the colonies in America. Familism, as a doctrine, was more or less prevalent among several sects. They held that no forms or doctrines were necessary, that as Moses had taught the law and Christ faith, so the third and new order of things was love. By love and contemplation they believed that they could get into direct communication with God, and therefore for them all ceremonies were useless. Love covered everything, and they called themselves The Family of Love.

The Seekers, like the Familists, had suddenly been allowed to read the Scriptures on which all religion was supposed to rest, and finding in them no authority for the doings of the church of the Middle Ages, they cut loose from everything. All sacraments and ordinances, and all church government, they said, had been utterly corrupted, and they were waiting and seeking for a new revelation. Roger Williams, who was banished from Massachusetts for heresy, and afterwards founded Rhode Island, was more or less affiliated with these people. They have sometimes been confused with the Familists. Penn, in his essay on "The Rise and Progress of the People called Quakers," speaks of the two sects as in reality one. Both they and the Familists are said to have worshipped in silence like the Quakers.

The Antinomians were very much like the Familists, and Antinomianism was a general name applied to people who relied on inward feeling and conviction ; had gone back, in fact, to a sort of natural religion, and were independent of all dogmas and all regularly organized churches. Mrs. Ann Hutchinson, who was so severely treated and finally banished from Massachusetts, was an Antinomian. Some of her followers who fled to Rhode Island became Quakers, and among them was Mary Dyer, who was afterwards hung for her new faith on Boston Common. Antinomianism led very directly to Quakerism.

But these queer sects did not last long, nor were they able to attract to themselves for any length of time such strong, intelligent, and devoted characters as were drawn to the Quakers. The Quakers supplied all that these sects had and a great deal more besides ; and they supplied it in a better way, and were better organized.

The reason the Quakers absorbed the others and survived seems to have been because they set forth the definite and intelligent plan of returning to primitive Christianity in its most ancient and simple form. To the seekers and others who thought that all religion had become hopelessly corrupt, they showed that original Christianity was still as pure as ever. Let us return, they said, to old Christianity as it existed during the first three centuries after the time of the apostles, before the Bishop of Rome became Pope, and before the great mass of dogma, superstition, fraud, and cruelty were developed by priestcraft.

The Church of England and the Puritans were halting half-way in the Reformation. They could satisfy the rich and powerful, but they could not satisfy the poor, the ordinary, or even the rich who had simple spiritual minds. Do not halt, then, said the Quakers. Go back all the way, back to the simple Christians of the Catacombs, the best and greatest of all Christians, who endured such terrible martyrdom, who lived such stainless lives, who were so affectionate in their families, and who put such touching, simple inscriptions on the tombs of their dead ; back to these Christians who were nearest to the Saviour, who had no system of dogma or theology, no doctrine of the Trinity, no transubstantiation or infallibility, and no formal creeds ; whose religion spread itself not by theology, cruelty, or force, but by its own moral superiority, its simple spirituality, the Sermon on the Mount, and the inward light from Christ.

So the Quakers became earnest students of the fathers of the church, as they are called, those very ancient writers, Tertullian, Irenæus, Justin Martyr, Cyprian, Eusebius, Origen, and others, who are the authorities for our knowledge of the primitive Christians, whose opinions are so numerous and so varied that they are store-houses of quotations for all sorts of religious belief, and who have always been the delight of those who explore the original sources of Christianity. There the Quakers found full justification for their peculiar doctrines. They found a spiritual worship free from elaborate ceremony. They found that the ministers and preachers received

no pay. They found complete freedom of opinion, the religious liberty which they longed to see established in England. They found also that some of these early Christians were opposed to oaths and also to war; and that they protested against vain fashions, corrupting amusements, and flattering titles.

The Quakers were by no means the first people who had uttered this cry for a return to primitive Christianity. It had been heard several times during the long night of the Middle Ages, but it was quickly smothered by an iron hand. The Albigenses in the south of France in the thirteenth century had been a numerous people and held a very pure and simple doctrine somewhat like that of the Quakers; but the armies of Pope Innocent III. within a few months slaughtered over two hundred thousand of them; and it is supposed that within a period of twenty years more than a million of them were put to death. The Waldenses of the Piedmont Valleys, who were a similar people, were also hunted down, and men, women, and children suffocated in their caves or cut to pieces by the soldiers of holy church.

If George Fox and the Quakers had appeared a century sooner, they would have been exterminated to a man; for their doctrine was more far-reaching, aggressive, and dangerous than the simple faith of such people as the Albigenses. But at the time the Quakers appeared the principles of the Reformation had advanced too far to allow of wholesale slaughtering. Nevertheless the government and sober-minded, religious people were willing to go a

long way in suppressing a belief which threatened to destroy everything that was conservative in both religion and manners. Ordinances were passed authorizing the justices of the peace to imprison any who should deny the validity of the two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, or maintain other principles of the Quaker belief. When they held their meetings in the street or market-place they were arrested for a breach of the peace. They were arrested as Sabbath-breakers when travelling to their meetings; and when wandering about in their missionary work they were arrested as vagrants and whipped.

After the restoration their punishments were increased. Old laws of Henry VIII.'s and Elizabeth's reign were applied to them. By these laws, which were aimed primarily at Roman Catholics, they could be imprisoned as well as lose their property for not paying tithes; and if they refused to attend the parish church, they could be fined, imprisoned, and finally banished. An act was also passed specially naming the Quakers, describing them as worse than rebels, and "a terror of the people;" and by this act, if they refused to take an oath, or argued or wrote against the practice, or if they held meetings among themselves, they could be fined, imprisoned, and finally banished. Another act provided that for unlawfully assembling they could be convicted and sentenced to three or five months' imprisonment by a magistrate without trial by jury. The officers of the militia and army were authorized to break up and disperse such assemblies and capture the

leaders; and the magistrates were authorized in executing the act to break into all dwelling-houses except the houses of peers of the realm.

Other acts which were originally intended to be used against the meetings of the Presbyterians and Independents were executed against the Quakers with great severity. These acts gave part of the fines to informers, who made it their business to live on the spoil and ruin of the Quakers, who lost the stock in their shops, and even their household goods and bedding, and some, reduced to abject poverty, were compelled to sleep on bare boards.

In the British colonies, the Bermudas, Jamaica, and other places similar punishments were inflicted. In Massachusetts the punishments were worse than in England. The Quakers, men and women, were stripped to the waist, tied to a cart's tail, and whipped from town to town; they were whipped with pitched ropes, branded in the hand, their ears cut off, and four of them, including a woman, were hung.

All these sufferings in England and other countries are described in great detail by the Quaker historians Sewell, Gough, Janney, and especially Besse. The Quakers were very careful to preserve in writing full accounts of all persecutions and sufferings at the time of their occurrence. Although they opposed learning and the higher education, there seems to have been none of the smaller sects that described and argued their religion so much in print. In the year 1708, as Janney tells us, when they had been in existence only about half a century, a catalogue of their books, published by John Whiting, contains

the names of five hundred and twenty-eight writers, and the titles of two thousand eight hundred books and tracts.

In this way they made a deep and powerful impression on their time, and their liberal views, their simple way of stating the Trinity and the divinity of Christ, their insistence on the spirituality of Christianity as opposed to ecclesiastical forms and dogmas, has now long since spread to other religious bodies, and is the general belief of modern times.

They not only took care that all their sufferings should be fully recorded and known, but their conduct in never avoiding punishment was unusual. The Presbyterians, Independents, Roman Catholics, and other dissenting bodies thought it no disgrace, when the laws were unusually severe against them, to go into hiding, to cease to practise their religion for a time, or to hold secret meetings. But the Quakers would never hold secret meetings, and it was a point of honor with them never to abstain from the open performance of their faith, no matter how much the magistrates stirred up the laws against them. For the cautious conduct of the other dissenters they had a supreme contempt, and referred to it sarcastically as "Christian prudence." A Quaker meeting might be raided by the soldiers and constables, and the house demolished, but the following Sunday those that remained uncaptured would be found holding a meeting on its ruins, where they were again an easy prey to the officials.

This extraordinary stubbornness exasperated the authorities against them more than ever, for it was a

burden to arrest and imprison so many of them. They filled up the jails, and it seemed impossible to check them as the other dissenters were checked and driven out of sight by punishing a few as examples. The Quakers were determined that if they were to be suppressed by imprisonment, it would be not by examples, but by imprisoning every individual Quaker in the country; and even then they would hold meetings in the jails until they had all died of dirt and disease.

The world at first laughed at this impolitic obstinacy, then wondered at it, and in the end was filled with profound respect and admiration for the people who lived up to it for nearly forty years. The Quakers seem to have been built up into their unusually strong position largely by this heroic principle of conduct. It was, indeed, a thoroughly Anglo-Saxon trait, and could have been exhibited by no other race.

The punishments in England, beginning with the Commonwealth times, were persisted in until 1672, when Charles II., by proclamation, suspended the execution of all penal laws against dissenters, and released from prison about four hundred Quakers. But this relief lasted only for about a year. In 1673 the informers returned to their business, and the prisons were again filled until James II. came to the throne in 1685. He released some thirteen hundred Quakers who were then in prison, and stopped the suits which were then in progress to fine or imprison several hundred more. In 1687 he issued his famous "Declaration of Indulgence," by

which, like Charles II., he suspended all the penal laws against dissenters. But this raised a great constitutional question of his right to suspend any laws, a question in which William Penn took, as we shall see, an important part.

There was, however, no more persecution of Quakers. It had practically ceased during the reign of King James. But the Quakers were not legally secured in their rights until 1688, the first year of the reign of William III., when the act was passed abolishing all penalties against Protestants and establishing the religious liberty which has since prevailed in England.

For a period of almost forty years from the time of the civil war until the reign of James II., the Quakers had been harried and punished, thousands of them despoiled of their property, thousands of them confined in the loathsome prisons of that age; and about five thousand, as Penn estimated, died of disease from confinement in those prisons. This severity accomplished in part, no doubt, its purpose: somewhat lessened their numbers, and kept their belief from spreading as far as it might have gone. But it utterly failed to suppress them. They endured those forty years of suffering, increased in numbers, won the respect of the world by their heroism, developed their doctrine, discipline, and organization, and their faith spread from the lower to the middle classes.

Their eccentricities of conduct, their bottle-breaking, brimstone-burning, and street-preaching passed away. They became a sedate, sober, thrifty people,

of most exemplary lives, and most earnest in all good works. They were leaders in the most advanced philanthropic movements of the age. Besides their persistent and sincere advocacy of religious liberty, they were the first advocates of the abolition of negro slavery, and they never faltered in their purpose until slavery had ceased to exist in the British possessions and in the United States.

They were the first prison reformers, a work suggested to them by the experience and sufferings of their own people amid the horrors of the English prisons of the seventeenth century. Men, women, and children were crowded together in these prisons mingled with the vilest and most degraded criminals, twenty or more of them sleeping together in one room, damp, cold, and indescribably filthy. The Quakers aroused public sentiment first to alleviate, and then to change this condition. They started the idea that a prison should be a workhouse, and many of the early Quakers when imprisoned followed their trades of shoemaking or tailoring as far as circumstances would allow. They established, also, the principle that a prison should be a reformatory, a place of moral improvement instead of a punishment by dirt and disease, and deeper moral degradation than could be found outside of its walls.

In connection with their work of prison reform, they opposed the indiscriminate manner in which the death penalty was inflicted for minor offences. In England at that time death was the punishment for over two hundred and fifty crimes. The Quakers

argued in favor of reducing the number to two,—murder and treason,—and wished even to abolish capital punishment altogether.

Although in their origin, and for a long time afterwards, they were opposed to higher education, colleges, and learning, they have in modern times greatly changed in this respect, especially in Pennsylvania, where the Philadelphia Quakers have made most successful efforts in the best sort of education, as their colleges at Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore clearly prove. They have interested themselves in the education of women, and also in women's rights, which is the natural out-growth of the liberty always allowed by them to women in preaching and in the conduct of church affairs.

It is no doubt true that, although they have engaged in all these liberal movements, they have been narrow in their views, and have gone about their work in a narrow way. Their long opposition to higher education would easily account for this. Nevertheless, it is also true that they have produced some very remarkable and very broad-minded men. William Penn and John Bright are the most noticeable instances in England; and in America the list is a long one: Benjamin West, one of the best artists of his time; John Bartram, the first American botanist; two of our best poets, Whittier and Bayard Taylor; John Dickinson, the author of the "Farmer's Letters in the Revolution;" two of the ablest generals of the Revolution, Greene and Mifflin; and Edward Cope, a modern Philadelphian of much eminence in science. There should

also be added to the list Ezra Cornell, who founded the great university in New York which bears his name ; and Lindley Murray, the grammarian.

The Quaker belief, although opposed to the higher learning and open to the charge of narrowness, and in its early stages to the charge of eccentricity, was nevertheless a rationalistic movement. Lecky has described it as a distorted rationalism. It was an heroic attempt to reform, advance, and liberalize the age. It was the last great wave or impulse of the Reformation, a violent and one might say an hysterical effort to return to the primitive Christianity of the first two centuries. In its day it possessed great attractions for honest minds like William Penn or Robert Barclay, who, as college-bred men, were weary of seeing education prostituted to the service of tyranny, superstition, and fraud ; who wished to see religion totally divorced from politics as well as from priestcraft, and established on a permanent basis of civil and religious liberty.

VI

CAVALIER OR QUAKER; OR BOTH

But whatever we may think of the Quakers after an impartial survey of their whole career, there is no doubt that in the year 1661 they were generally regarded as a despised, eccentric, street- and field-preaching, wandering sect, continually punished by fine and imprisonment under the law. What could there be in such people that would attract to them William Penn, a youth of the upper class enjoying his athletic sports and studies at an upper-class Church of England college? The only answer would seem to be that the boy was born with a certain sincere earnestness, a serious-mindedness, and a natural inclination for religion. There was also evidently in his nature a strong basis of heroism, which he had gained, no doubt, by inheritance. It cost him but little effort to dare to follow the leading of his powerful and, indeed, passionate religious feeling.

He had never, so far as can be discovered, been under the dominion of much dogma. His associations in his boyhood's home at Wanstead had, as we have already said, been Puritan. He was already inclined to rely on his own inward convictions; and sincere and earnest as he was, and disposed to take

religion literally, he found something congenial among the people who relied more than any others on inward feeling and conviction as against dogmas and ceremonies. Before long he also discovered that for an educated mind the suggestion of returning to primitive Christianity was a grand and fruitful thought. Among the primitive Christians of the first three centuries could be found liberty and a multitude of inspiring philosophic and religious ideas. On these the intellect and moral nature could freely exercise themselves without the degradation of feeling that they were being prostituted in the service of priestly humbug and superstition.

He wandered unconsciously into this influence which was destined to seize him sooner or later. The Quakers had already been up and down in Oxford, and not a few students had succumbed. But it was the preaching of Thomas Loe, to whom he one day accidentally listened, that touched Penn. He and some other undergraduates abandoned the chapel services of the colleges and went to hear the Quakers ; and it has even been said that they held private prayer-meetings among themselves. For this neglect of the college chapel services they had to pay fines ; but, nothing deterred, they went still further, and there is a tradition that Penn and Robert Spencer, afterwards Lord Sunderland, in their hatred of outward forms, "fell upon those students who appeared in surplices, and he and they together tore them everywhere over their heads."

From a letter written by Penn in 1683 to Lord Sunderland, it appears that they first made each

other's acquaintance in France in 1663, after Penn had left Oxford, so that the tradition associating them as companions in the attack on the surplices may be wrong. But it is extremely probable that Penn took some pronounced part in that general opposition to the surplices which prevailed among the students; for we hear that he was expelled from the college for some conduct relating to his religious opinions. This expulsion has been doubted by his biographer, Stoughton; but Penn himself, in speaking of his early religious life, said, "Of my persecution at Oxford, and how the Lord sustained me in the midst of that hellish darkness and debauchery; of my being banished the college." *

It is difficult to tell whether this word banished means that he was suspended, as it would now be called, for a time or expelled; but it probably means expelled. He seems to have been at Christ Church about two years, and this banishment brought his course there to an end. Apparently he did not altogether neglect the studies that were proper for a cavalier, and although he seems to have been a serious-minded undergraduate protesting against collegiate debauchery, and more and more imbued with Quaker influence, he did not reach the point of actually joining the sect. From entries in Pepys's diary, the admiral seems to have had thoughts of removing his son to Cambridge, but whether for the purpose of breaking up his Quaker notions is not clear.

* Journey into Holland and Germany (Life prefixed to Works), p. 92.

When, however, Penn finally left Oxford and returned to his father in London, the admiral was greatly vexed at the state of the young man's feelings. He went wandering about the city, looking up Quakers and consorting with them ; and he appeared to have no taste for the court and a cavalier's life. From that time the struggle between father and son reads like a comedy. The father, we are told, tried persuasions and threats, and when these proved of no avail, resorted to blows, which also failing of their purpose, he fell into a transport of rage and drove the boy from his house, to which, however, he was afterwards enabled to return by the intercession of his mother.*

This account has been described by Stoughton and also by Granville Penn as traditional and very much exaggerated. But Penn himself, in his "Journey into Holland and Germany," after speaking of his banishment from college, adds, "The bitter usage I underwent when I returned to my father, whipping, beating, and turning out of doors in 1662."

The violence and turning out of doors proving as unsuccessful as the banishment from college, a rather lucky thought occurred to the admiral. He would divert the boy's mind by things which were unlike religion. So he sent him with some gay people of the court to travel in France in the hope that he would pick up something besides fanaticism.

This hope seems to have been partly realized.

---

* Gough, History of the Quakers, vol. ii. p. 214.

He visited Italy as well as France, and Pepys describes him in August, 1664, soon after his return.

"This day my wife tells me Mr Pen, Sir William's son, is come back from France and came to visit her. A most modish person grown, she says, a fine gentleman." (Vol iv. pp. 228, 229.)

"After dinner comes Mr. Pen to visit me, and staid an houre talking with me. I perceive something of learning he hath got, but a great deal if not too much of the vanity of the French garbe and affected manner of speech and gait. I fear all real profit he hath made of his travel will signify little." (Vol. iv. p. 231.)

Penn at this time was no doubt a fresh-faced young Englishman of considerable attractiveness; with much manner and conversation, and capable as the French would say of "success with women." He found Mrs. Pepys's society so agreeable that Pepys became very jealous.

"Against my will left them together, but God knows without any reason of fear in my conscience of any evil between them, but such is my natural folly." (Vol. iv. p. 243. See also p. 236.)

A hardened old rascal like Pepys, who was continually making love to other men's wives, was naturally very suspicious. But nothing came of it, and he afterwards speaks of young Penn as very merry talking of his travels and French humors.

From a letter of P. Gibson we learn what was part of Penn's new French garb. "I remember your honor very well," Gibson writes, "when you newly came out of France and wore pantaloon breeches."

Penn had, in fact, become what we would now call a Franco-maniac. He spoke French fluently, and the admiral was very much pleased with his polite and courtly behavior. We read also that he

fought with a desperado in the streets of Paris, and was skilful enough in fencing to knock his opponent's sword from his hand. But he declined to stab to death his disarmed enemy, as he had a right to do under the code. He had without doubt become a good deal of a cavalier; and this quality he retained all his life. But, strange to say, while travelling in France he went to the Protestant college at Saumur, where for a few months he studied theology under Moses Amyrault, a famous divine of that time. Whatever qualities the father might add to his character, the boy was evidently determined to follow his own religious bent.

The doctrine taught by Amyrault was a sort of modified and liberal Calvinism, deemed rank heresy by many Calvinists. But Penn seems to have been unaffected by it. He studied general theological history, and apparently for the purpose of giving himself a more enlightened understanding of the whole subject of religion. He studied particularly the writings of the early fathers of the church, that he might the better understand that primitive Christianity which the Quakers professed, and which was always uppermost in his thoughts. He was trying to see in the Quakerism by which his ardent young heart was touched something deeper and broader than the eccentricities which aroused so much hatred and punishment. He was looking for a religion which an honest educated gentleman could follow without being a sycophantic Churchman, a shuffling, traitorous Roman Catholic, or a whining, malignant Puritan.

He seems to have always looked at the new faith in a very different light from that which inspired the rugged unlettered Fox, and it is impossible to find in Penn any of Fox's visions, miracles, or fanaticism. Penn wrote largely against oaths ; but very little on hat honor or on what now seems the lighter and least important part of Quaker doctrine. He was trying to build on larger foundations and with more substantial and lasting material.

But he had not yet joined the Quakers. It seems probable that he was not yet altogether satisfied with them. Judging from what he afterwards related of himself, he was unable at this time to find any form of religion that fully satisfied him. He had become a Seeker. But he went on investigating, and for one so young he investigated with considerable thoroughness.

Soon after his return from France his father went with the Duke of York to fight the Dutch, and Penn meantime had been entered a student at Lincoln's Inn to study law. This was in continuation of the father's careful plan of education. His son, who was to become a courtier and public man, and possibly hold an important office under the crown, must have some general idea of law. So young Penn, who had been to college at Oxford, studied theology in France, and travelled through a large part of Europe, was now to be further broadened by another study. It will be interesting to see how a man trained in this way will view the struggling Quaker faith.

The plague which broke out in London inter-

rupted the law studies, and Penn, like many others who could escape from the city, retired to the country. The cavalier side of his character seems to have found little employment in the silence of the fields, and, as he afterwards related, the scenes of the plague had made a serious impression on him. His contemplative and religious mood began to get the upper hand again ; and when his father returned he saw evident signs of a bad relapse.

He thought he would try again the remedy that had already been successful with this disease. He sent the youth to join the Duke of Ormond, who, as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, kept at Dublin a court of no little gayety and splendor. A remedy often used, however, is apt to lose its power ; and it seems this second dose of gayety was not accomplishing all that was expected. A variation of it was tried, which came very near being entirely successful.

The youth was given some serious worldly work to do. The admiral was governor of Kinsale, in the county of Cork, far to the south from Dublin, and close to that famous headland still a guide to sailors, and still known as the "Old Head of Kinsale." There was a fort within it and a company of soldiers, of which the admiral was nominal captain, in much the same way that he was governor of Kinsale, this being one of those posts of profit, honor, and very little trouble which he held by favor of the crown, and constituted part of his Irish estates. He gave his son some sort of oversight of this feudal holding and the district round it, and the young

man seems also to have held an office called "clerk of the cheque, Kinsale." But in these positions he was still under the command of the Duke of Ormond as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.

The responsibility and interest of his new occupations, the pleasure of doing real work in the world, drew his mind so far from his religious studies that when a mutiny broke out among the troops at Carrickfergus he took a vigorous part in quelling it. The Duke of Ormond was so pleased with his conduct that he suggested that he be made captain of his father's company of soldiers.

Judging from the letter written by the duke, it seems that the father himself had at one time thought of this. Young Penn seems to have been eager for it. But the father's answer implies that he thought his son's vanity had become inflated with success, and that he was too young for such a command. "As to the tender made by his grace the lord lieutenant," he says, "concerning the fort at Kinsale, I wish your youthful desires mayn't outrun your discretion."

It was at this time that the armor portrait of Penn already described in the first chapter is supposed to have been painted. Public business and the accidental arousing of the fighting qualities he had inherited from his father were drawing him very decidedly away from religion. "The glory of the world," he afterwards said, "overtook me, and I was even ready to give myself unto it." If his father had yielded on that one point, and let him be captain of the company, the result might have been perma-

nent, and there would be no necessity for writing this biography.

But one day Penn went to Cork on business, and hearing that his old friend, Thomas Loe, whom he had known at Oxford, was to preach, he went to hear him. The burden of the sermon was, "There is a faith which overcomes the world, and there is a faith which is overcome by the world," and Penn was deeply moved. His faith was evidently being overcome by the world. We can readily imagine how the fighting spirit, which had been so recently aroused within him, would now combine with his natural religious fervor and carry him completely away. Should he overcome or be overcome. The fire in his blood would admit of only one answer. The doctrine struck home, and Penn never again vacillated. From that day he was a Quaker.

The methods used by his father had, however, gone so far that the young man's character had been partially formed by them. He was double. He was both a cavalier and a Quaker. He became a recognized leader and preacher, the author of numerous theological works, and at the same time he passed a large part of his days at court, would dress handsomely on occasions, could be gay and jovial, and took part in politics and other things somewhat inconsistent with what is supposed to be Quaker doctrine. So much was this side of his character developed that in spite of his great abilities his sect were at the time of the revolution of 1688 a little inclined to dispense with his services.

This double nature was at the same time his

strength and his weakness. His father had been double in politics, belonging first to the Roundheads and then to the Royalists. The son belonged both to the world and to religion, not to one after the other, but to both at the same time, and seems to have been perfectly sincere in both. He became that apparently impossible combination, a Quaker courtier, and that is the key to his character.

It will be well at this point to quote the whole of the passage from his "Journey into Holland and Germany," already several times referred to, in which he sums up the religious history of his youth.

"I let them know how and when the Lord first appeared unto me, which was about the twelfth year of my age, *anno.* 1656; and how, at times, betwixt that and the fifteenth, the Lord visited me, and the divine impressions he gave me of himself; of my persecution at Oxford, and how the Lord sustained me in the midst of that hellish darkness and debauchery; of my being banished the college; the bitter usage I underwent when I returned to my father, whipping, beating, and turning out of doors in 1662. Of the Lord's dealings with me in France, and in the time of the great plague in London; in fine, the deep sense he gave me of the vanity of this world, of the irreligiousness of the religious of it; then, of my mournful and bitter cries to him that he would show me his own way of life and salvation, and my resolution to follow him, whatever reproaches of suffering should attend me, and that with great reverence and brokeness of spirit. How, after all this, the glory of the world overtook me, and I was even ready to give up myself unto it, seeing as yet no such thing as the primitive spirit and church on the earth; and being ready to faint concerning my hope of the restitution of all things." (Life prefixed to Works (1726), p. 92.)

The last part of this passage shows that in Penn's studies and thoughts in his youth the struggle was principally to find the original spirit and essential of Christianity, or as he puts it "the primitive spirit

and church." For this purpose the young man had sat in Quaker meetings and studied at Saumur, in France, without being influenced by French Calvanism. It is also evident that in his early experiences he belonged to that class of persons who were then called Seekers, who believed that all forms of Christianity were so corrupted as to be invalid, and that a new revelation must be awaited; for he speaks of his deep sense of the "irreligiousness of the religious," and of his inability to find any "such thing as the primitive spirit and church on the earth."

VII

FIRST IMPRISONMENT AND ROUGHNESS OF ENGLISH LIFE

But after all his studies and experiences, his student life at Oxford, his travels in France and Italy, his investigations of the early fathers under the great professor at Saumur, his intercourse with gay people in Europe, in London, and with the Duke of Ormond in Ireland, his public employment on his father's feudal holding at Kinsale,—after all this, and after doubting whether there was any true or valid church on earth, and after considerable knowledge of Quaker meetings, Penn made the final decision that those Quakers were sufficiently near to primitive Christianity to justify his sacrificing himself in the cause which they had at heart.

He remained in Ireland attending to his father's affairs, making no change in his life or even in his cavalier dress; but he attended the Quaker meetings in Cork. Very soon, as might be expected, he was caught in one of those raids which were constantly made on the Quakers. Several constables, backed by a party of soldiers, entered the meeting where he was, September 3, 1667, and arrested everybody on the old charge of holding a riotous assembly. There is an apocryphal story that a soldier first entered the meeting to disturb it, on which Penn took him by

the collar and would have thrown him down-stairs if some prominent members had not interfered on the plea that such conduct would be inconsistent with the principles of their religion.

But we can safely reject this along with the other tales in the Harvey manuscript. Penn had too much sense to be guilty of such foolishness. He went with the others before the mayor, who, observing his dress, offered to release him on bond for his good behavior. This he refused, and argued with the mayor on the unlawfulness of arresting peaceable people under a statute which was intended only to suppress the Fifth Monarchy murderers. He was sent to prison, and there addressed an admirable letter to the Earl of Orrery, Lord-President of Munster, asking to be released. He argued with great dignity and spirit on the unlawfulness of his arrest, and the bad policy of such interference with people's religious convictions.

"But I presume, my Lord, the acquaintance you have had with other countries, must needs have furnished you with this infallible observation: that diversities of faith and worship contribute not to the disturbance of any place, where moral uniformity is barely requisite to preserve the peace. It is not long since you were a good solicitor for the liberty I now crave, and concluded no way so effectual to improve or advantage this country, as to dispense with freedom in things relating to conscience; and I suppose were it riotous or tumultuary, as by some vainly imagined, your lordship's inclination, as well as duty, would entertain a very remote opinion. My humble supplication, therefore, to you is, that so malicious and injurious a practice to innocent Englishmen, may not receive any countenance or encouragement from your lordship, for as it is contrary to the practice elsewhere, and a bad argument to invite English hither, so, with submission, will it not resemble that clemency and English spirit, that hath hitherto made you honorable."

It was an excellent letter for a youth of twenty-three. But what a scrape he was in! What a talk and scandal there must have been among the grand people of the Duke of Ormond's court at Dublin when it was known that their late companion, young Penn, the son of the admiral, with all his fine clothes on, was caught by the soldiers in a Quaker meeting! It would have been better to have been caught in a brothel or the lowest den of vice.

To save him, if possible, from such associations as he had fallen into, the Earl of Orrery at once released him, and often afterwards Penn was gently handled by the government because he was a cavalier, and cavaliers could not bear to see him degraded.

The admiral began to hear of these things, and ordered his son home. He promptly appeared, and as there was no change in his dress or outward appearance for some time nothing was said. Pepys heard of his return from that voluble gossip Mrs. Turner.

"At night comes Mrs. Turner to see us; and then among other talk she tells me that Mr William Pen who is lately come over from Ireland is a Quaker again, or some very melancholy thing; that he cares for no company, nor comes into any; which is a pleasant thing after his being abroad so long and his father such a hypocritical rogue and at this time an atheist." (Vol. vii. p. 253.)

Before long, however, the admiral noticed that his son always kept his hat on, at that time a serious disrespect to a parent. An explanation was demanded, and Penn openly declared his principles, and announced that nothing would now restrain him

from remaining a Quaker. Entreaties again proving of no avail, the admiral asked if he would not at least take off his hat in the presence of his father, the king, and the Duke of York.

Such an offer of compromise on the part of the admiral was unusual, and must have been the result of many days' controversy with his son. Beaten at every point, the distressed father at last pathetically pleaded for the respect due to himself and to the two persons, the king and the Duke of York, on whom the family fortunes depended. He thought he could at least secure this ; and, indeed, his unruly young Quaker yielded so far as to say that he would take time to consider.

This infuriated the father, because he thought his son was going off to consult the Quakers. But Penn replied that he would consult with none of them, and before long, after much inward conflict, respectfully told his father that he could not comply with his request.

The admiral was again in a rage, and turned his son out of doors. Penn wandered about, living at the houses of friends and supplied secretly by his mother with money. The admiral, of course, had to relent. He allowed his son to come home to live ; but treated him almost as a stranger.

Penn was now to begin his life's work in earnest ; and it may be well to consider what England was at this time, its ideals and its manners. It was very different from the England which we see to-day on our summer holiday trips across the Atlantic. Instead of the present population of thirty million,

it had scarcely five million, hardly as much as the present population of Pennsylvania. London, instead of containing over four million people, had only about five hundred thousand, and was only a trifle larger than the modern Boston or Baltimore. The five million people were gathered in the southern part of the island, south of a line drawn across the country from Liverpool to the Humber River. North of this line to the Scottish border was a wilderness where the Scotch pillaged and marauded and the mosstroopers stole cattle, where the scattered inhabitants lived in a state of barbarism with their blood-hounds to track robbers, and, like the early settlers of the American wilderness, administered swift and sure justice on horse-thieves.

Even south of this wilderness, where most of the people were to be found, the face of the country was wild. There were vast forests and moors covered with furze. A great deal of the country was overflowed, and this fen land, which has now been neary all drained, was the home of immense quantities of wild-fowl. The country people lived on widely scattered rude farms, with occasional baronial castles. One entered this rough, wild country as soon as he left the outskirts of a village or town; and you would have looked in vain at that time for the highly cultivated land, the trim farms, and country places, with their green hedge-rows and fat cattle, which the modern railway tourist now passes in such endless succession.

In fact, the English people of that day lived almost as much in the wilderness and as close to wild

nature as those who had emigrated to America. On any of the great highways of travel every one, as night came on, hastened to reach an inn, for there was no road that was free from highwaymen. Evelyn, in going from Tunbridge Wells to London, was waylaid and left bound in a solitary place tormented by the blazing sun and the swarms of flies and ants. His account of his capture and escape reads like the tales of similar adventures at the same period among the Indians in America.

Within a couple of hours' drive of London, great herds of fallow-deer ranged through the forests; and within a couple of days' journey could be found the magnificent red deer, almost as large as an American elk, and wandering in herds that sometimes numbered five hundred. The wild bull with a white mane wandered in the woods of the more remote districts. On the open downs bustards, a bird as large as the American wild turkey, roamed in large flocks and were hunted with greyhounds. Fox-hunting had not then become the national sport; and the fox, instead of being carefully preserved, was slaughtered by hundreds as a pest. The wild boars, which had been very numerous and were preserved for the sport of the king and nobility, were exterminated by the farmers during the civil war.

Nor had England then become famous for her breeds of horses and cattle. The native horses were small and cheap. The best for the saddle were imported from Spain, and those used for draught were brought from Flanders. As these heavy Flemish

mares drew the great lumbering coaches through the narrow streets of London, splashing the offal and filth of the kennel on every side, pedestrians rushed to the wall and turned their backs. At night those same streets were unlighted, and one might very well have been safer on the country roads. Thieves and footpads might be met at any turn, or roistering young fellows who had started out to beat the watch, upset sedan chairs, and insult women. If these dangers were escaped, one might still at any moment receive the contents of a bucket emptied from a garret window.

We should naturally expect that the dress of the people would conform to their surroundings, or be of color that would least show the accidents through which they might have passed. But, on the contrary, they travelled their rough roads, during half the year almost impassable with mud, ran the gauntlet of highwaymen or the showers of filth in London's streets in most fantastic clothes of scarlet, blue, and yellow, with feathers in their hats. "I saw," says Pepys, "the King, the Dukes and all their attendants go forth in the rain to the City and it bedraggled many a fine suit of clothes." * Pepys's description of his clothes, with the long list of their now meaningless names, and the way in which he developed his costume with his increasing prosperity, seems ludicrous enough now, but was an important matter with him.

All sorts of fashions broke out among them.

* Pepys's Diary, ed. of 1893, vol. i. p. 193.

French clothes became an extravagant tyranny which Charles II. determined to break; and as clothes were then as important as politics, he announced his resolution to his council. He would start a new and modest fashion which should never be altered: "a long cassock, close to the body, of black cloth, and pinked with white silk under it, and a coat over it, and the legs ruffled with black riband like a pigeon's leg." But Louis XIV. and the French nobility, to check this revolt against the supremacy of their nation, put their footmen in the new costume. It became a livery, and no English gentleman dare wear it.

These gay people, with their embroidered and velvet coats, fringed gloves, camlet cloaks, gold and silver buttons, and huge wigs, which were bedraggled in the rain and mud of London, were not so particular when they went to bed. Night-clothes were not usually worn, and people went to bed stark naked. Possibly some of the upper classes may have worn night-clothes, for we read in Pepys's diary and other books of the time that it was a recognized custom for ladies while in bed to receive visitors of both sexes, as well as to receive visits while they were dressing; and the same custom prevailed in France.

It is needless to say that the language habitually used to ladies by the cavaliers was of a plain-spoken coarseness and licentiousness that has long since passed away; and the ladies in their turn sang songs and made jests which would now in the lowest variety theatre be instantly suppressed by the police.

There were, of course, exceptions. There were ladies and cavaliers who protested against habitual swearing and obscenity, and lived up to their protests. If we can believe his word, William Penn was one of these. Once, when he was imprisoned in the Tower, Sir John Robinson taunted him with having been as free in speech and morals before he turned Quaker as any other cavalier.

"When and where?" said Penn. "I charge thee to tell the company to my face."

"Abroad and at home, too," said Sir John.

"No, no, Sir John," broke in some one who was present, "that is too much."

"I make this bold challenge," said Penn, "to all men, women, and children upon earth, justly to accuse me of ever having seen me drunk, heard me swear, utter a curse, or speak one obscene word (much less that I ever made it my practice). I speak this to God's glory, that has ever preserved me from the power of those pollutions, and that from a child begat an hatred in me towards them. But there is nothing more common than when men are of a more severe life than ordinary, for loose persons to comfort themselves with the conceit that 'they were once as they are.'"

The theatre of those days, of course, reflected in public the license that was so freely allowed in private life. The play-writers could produce nothing much but obscenity; and no plays of any literary merit were written. It was a sad change since Shakespeare's days, when English minds, youthful and ardent and full of beautiful fancies, enjoyed "The Tempest" and "Midsummer Night's Dream," the noble melancholy of Hamlet, the jolly "Taming of the Shrew," or the grand tragedies of Macbeth and Cæsar. They were chivalrous, generous, like Raleigh, dreaming of tender love or brilliant enter-

prise; they sailed the seas for the glory of adventure and to see undiscovered lands. But now everything was turned to dirt, sordidness, and corruption.

Charles II. admitted to his presence as an amusing character Blood, the assassin, who had attempted the lives of the Duke of Ormond and the keeper of the Tower. Most of us are familiar with the old story, "how at a ball at court, a child was dropped by one of the ladies in dancing." They carried it off in a handkerchief, "and the king had it in his closet a week after, and did dissect it, making great sport of it." His lords and ladies danced together naked, or smeared one another's faces with candle-grease and soot till they looked like devils. The Duke of York gets Lord Clarendon's daughter with child, and Clarendon willingly declares his daughter a strumpet, so that the duke need not think of marrying her, and Sir Charles Berkeley, to help the matter out, swore he had been with her, and for this he was given a pension and made Earl of Falmouth. And Pepys bluntly tells us how the duke "hath come out of his wife's bed and gone to others laid in bed for him." These, we must remember, were Penn's friends at court, the men on whom he relied to help him protect the Quakers and retain his vast province of Pennsylvania.

It would be easy to fill many pages with instances of the rough manners of all classes. A man was thought none the less of if in a public place he seized some buxom woman and kissed her. Pepys relates several instances of kissing ladies in sport when

dining at a tavern; and people of quality of that time were constantly going out to dine together at the taverns. The cavaliers were outrageous in these matters. The king, Pepys says, would get Mrs. Stewart in a corner and hug and kiss her for half an hour "to the observation of all the world."

But the most shocking ruggedness was the way in which everybody went to see executions; a custom which is apparently beginning to be restored with us at our negro burnings. And such executions! Hanging and beheading were not enough, and failed to satisfy the crowd. When Strafford was executed, the people complained that he had not been cut open and compelled to see his entrails burning before his eyes. In the descriptions of these scenes, written by men of the time, it is difficult to find a single word revealing the slightest abhorrence or pity.

"I went out to Charing Cross, to see Major General Harrison hanged drawn and quartered; which was done there, he looking as cheerful as any man could do in that condition. He was presently cut down, and his head and heart shown to the people, at which there were great shouts of joy." (Pepys's Diary, ed. of 1893, vol. i. p. 260.)

But we must not suppose that because these people were rough and cruel, that some of them had not elevated sentiments and amusements, and many of the best amenities of life, like the men of the previous century, when Elizabeth was queen. In spite of the devilish doings of the cavaliers, there were many who enjoyed art, literature, and music. Men like Evelyn and Locke were striving to improve every means of life and thought. Others

were struggling with the beginnings of modern science. They had for their contemporary the noble author of "Paradise Lost;" and Dryden, Waller, Cowley, and Butler were writing the verse which after the lapse of over two hundred years has still the power to charm us. It would be as great a mistake to suppose them completely lacking in nobility of life as to suppose that we ourselves are altogether lacking because we burn negroes to death at the stake and have more unpunished murders and assassinations than have ever before been known in history.

The people of Penn's time seem to have had a strong taste for music, and there was a great deal of playing on flutes, viols, and harps, and singing of songs. Pepys often speaks of his song-book as one of his most treasured volumes. He solaced himself with music almost every evening. He sometimes carried his flute in his pocket, and when travelling in Holland played in the stage-coach; and we find him one day stopping business at the Navy Department to play on the organ with some friends before dinner. In the commonwealth times music had been suppressed by the Puritans. Parliament passed an ordinance for systematically destroying all the church organs throughout the country. But when the king came to his own again the cavaliers became more musical than ever for the sake of annoying the Puritans.

There was a great deal of ease and amusement, and much luxury. Some of the courtiers, it is said, lived in rooms in which the furniture was of solid

silver, and there were decorated ceilings which cost half as much as the house. All kinds of games were popular, tennis, billiards, bowls, all the games we have now and many long since gone out of use. At Whitehall the officials and ministers debated their state affairs walking up and down the corridors. Intercourse with the licentious king was easy and not very formal. Pepys, when he saw the king or the Duke of York out walking, seems to have gone up and spoken to them as though they had been boon companions.

If we examine the portraits of those times, such, for example, as those which have been engraved in Lodge's famous volumes, we get from the costumes and faces a strong impression of a people who were far from destitute of culture. In fact, the age was full of the most extraordinary contradictions existing side by side. Such men as Milton or Dryden, Locke or Penn, daily heard language and saw sights in the streets that would amaze and horrify the modern world. The standing source of caricature and wit for a long time was the Rump Parliament, a name which originated in an indecent jest, and it was harped on for years by butcher boys exhibiting parts of dead animals in the streets or throwing them into windows, or by pictures of a vileness that cannot now even be described.

There was one constant sight from which no traveller could keep his eyes. The heads of the many notorious political malefactors were stuck about as barbaric ornaments in various parts of London, on Temple Bar or on the bridge, and in

the smaller towns where insurrections had been suppressed. After the Restoration, when the regicides were drawn and quartered, their quarters were hung up in the streets like butchers' meat. The bodies of Cromwell, Ireton, and Bradshaw were taken from their graves, their heads cut off and mounted in the city. There, along with the other grim trophies of popular vengeance, they rotted in the wind and rain, the dishevelled hair slowly falling out, and the grinning skull becoming more and more ghastly as the flesh dried up and fell away, while beneath them in the foggy, muddy streets, surged that strange life of brilliant, gay cavaliers, sombre, stern Puritans, wild-eyed Fifth Monarchy men, Familists, Antinomians, Seekers, and other strange sects, all warring, jarring, persecuting, and tearing one another over those wonderful principles of free government and free religion which in a hundred years created the great American republic, and, may we hope, spread to the utmost ends of the earth.

VIII

CONTROVERSY, FIRST PRINCIPLES, AND IMPRISONMENT

A FEW months after he was turned out of his father's house, Penn became a recognized preacher among the Quakers. Events had moved rapidly with him. In September, 1667, he had been finally converted at Cork, by listening to Thomas Loe. That same autumn he returned to his father in England, and in 1668, we are informed, he was accepted as a preacher.

He was twenty-four years old; and he had probably quickly shown a facility for public speaking in the meetings he had attended. His mind had been long absorbed in religious subjects, and his education was an advantage. The Quakers were no doubt glad to have secured a convert from the cavalier class, and he was almost the first of this class that had come to them. Robert Barclay joined them about the same time; and, indeed, this seems to have been the period when educated men were coming forward to rationalize and soften the fanaticism of Fox and the crudities of the old Familists and Seekers. Besides Penn and Barclay, there were Whitehead, Ellwood, and Pennington, who were soon engaged in this work.

Twenty-five or thirty years afterwards Leslie, a

very sharp critic of the Quakers, described the effect upon them of Penn's writings.

"Especially of late some of them have made nearer advances towards Christianity than ever before; and among them the ingenious Mr. Penn has of late refined some of their gross notions, and brought them into some form, and has made them speak sense and English, of both which George Fox, their first and great apostle, was totally ignorant. . . . They endeavor all they can to make it appear that their doctrine was uniform from the beginning, and that there has been no alteration; and therefor they take upon them to defend all the writings of George Fox, and others of the first Quakers, and turn and wind them to make them (but it is impossible) agree with what they teach now at this day." ("The Snake in the Grass," introduction to 3d ed. of 1698.)

The exact nature of this work done by Penn, Barclay, and others seems to have been to ignore the visions and half inclination to miracles of Fox, and in place of them argue in an orderly and learned manner for the simple faith they found among the Quakers, show that it was in close conformity to the primitive Christianity of the first three centuries, and disclose the political importance of its unusually advanced ideas of religious liberty. To the part relating to religious liberty Penn especially devoted himself.

Fox was incapable of work of this sort, but he could lay the foundation for it. His famous letter to the Governor of Barbadoes is regarded by many Quakers as their creed, as the original and simple statement of their faith, from which there is to be no deviation. In spite of bad grammar and the obscure, even unintelligible phrases of which Fox was guilty, there was a germinal power in his thought which

cannot be ignored. Penn late in life said of him, "As abruptly and brokenly as sometimes his sentences would fall from him about divine things, it is well known they were often as texts to many fairer declarations." Macaulay, who never spares either Fox or Penn, sharply adds, "that is to say, George Fox talked nonsense, and some of his friends paraphrased it into sense."

But to return to Penn, who has just become a Quaker preacher. He retained, as we have already said in the first chapter, most of his cavalier dress. There is a tradition that he even continued to wear his sword, which was then a customary part of the costume of a man of rank or fashion. He consulted George Fox about it, saying that the weapon was hardly consistent with their principles, but it had saved his life in Paris without injuring his antagonist. Fox answered, "I advise thee to wear it as long as thou canst."

Afterwards, meeting Penn without the sword, he said,—

"William, where is thy sword?"

"Oh," said Penn, "I have taken thy advice. I wore it as long as I could."

It is probable that he wore the cavalier hat, or the fashionable hat of the time, stripped of its excessive ornamentation, nearly all his life. When James II. was king, which was when Penn was past forty, he and Penn were talking one day, and the king, who was a Roman Catholic, asked him to explain the difference between that religion and the Quaker faith. Penn pointed to their hats, which were ex-

actly alike except that the king's was covered with feathers and ribbons, "The only difference," said Penn, "lies in the ornaments that have been added to thine."

This very clever and politic answer disposed of a dangerous question. George Fox would have answered differently, and there would have been trouble. But Penn was always careful not to give personal offence by his religion. "I know no religion," he once said, "which destroys courtesy, civility, and kindness," and we have already noted that he sometimes avoided using the offensive thee and thou language in his letters.

But at the time of which we are now writing, the year 1668, the first of his preaching life, this cavalier Quaker, whether with or without a sword, cut and slashed about him with considerable vigor. He began immediately to write controversial pamphlets. The moderation of our time in these matters was then unknown, and the advocate of a sect would not have been respected or even understood unless he hit hard.

His first tract was called "Truth Exalted," and consisted of sweeping abuse, in the rough language of the times, of all religions except his own. Pepys described it as "a ridiculous, nonsensical book." The papists were told that their church was the whore of Babylon, the corrupter of the nations, drunk with the blood of saints and martyrs, their whole religion founded and maintained by inhuman bloodshed and cruelty, and he goes on to rail at their holy water, "baby baptism," bowings, crosses, images, and

Peter's chair. The Church of England was another persecutor, lustful, proud, and wicked, that had made no progress in the Reformation, but clung to organs, fonts, "baby baptism," holy days, "with much more such like dirty trash and foul superstition." As for the Puritans and other dissenters, they were hypocrites, revilers of God, whom they represented as worse than the worst man, and their doctrine of mere human origin.

It is to be noticed in this tract that Penn, though a college-bred youth, protests against learning and higher education as an injury to religion. He also declares his belief in the possibility of human perfection on earth as against original sin and total depravity.

During the spring and summer of this year, 1668, he went twice to court in company with other Quakers to urge the release of those members of their faith who were in prison. The first time their application was made to the Duke of Buckingham, who favored liberty, but could do nothing for them. Their second application was to the secretary of state, Sir Henry Berwick; and again they failed. Penn's companions on these occasions were George Whitehead, Josiah Coale, and Thomas Loe. They doubtless took Penn with them, because, as a cavalier and a son of the admiral, he might arouse some interest in their favor. This was his first attempt to use his cavalier character in this way, and, though unsuccessful in this instance, he followed it up more effectually in later years, and, as a Quaker courtier, accomplished some very substantial results.

He soon wrote another hard-hitting controversial pamphlet called "The Guide Mistaken;" and about the same time, or soon after, two Presbyterians of the congregation of Thomas Vincent, at Spittlefields, London, became Quakers. The enraged Vincent stormed against the "damnable doctrines" that had seduced them, and called Penn a Jesuit. Penn and George Whitehead immediately challenged him to an open debate before his own congregation. These debates were common at that time, and usually very uproarious affairs.

When Penn and Whitehead arrived, they had to push their way through the crowded congregation, while Vincent, who was waiting for them all prepared, kept up a running fire of denunciation. Penn and Whitehead, however, plunged into the wordy war, and amid hisses and calls of Jesuit, blasphemer, damnable villain, maintained for a long time an argument on the doctrine of the Trinity, while Vincent kept interrupting them with savage questions. He affected to be shocked at their arguments, and fell suddenly to prayer, charging them with blasphemy. The congregation blew out the candles and tried to pull down the Quakers. Nobody was satisfied with the result, and they tried to no purpose to arrange for another debate.

This induced Penn to write a pamphlet, and a very famous one, called "The Sandy Foundation Shaken," which set forth his rejection of the doctrine of the Trinity as commonly stated. At the same time it attacked the doctrine of the atonement for the sins of the world by the death of Christ, and

the doctrine of imputative righteousness. That was certainly enough to get a young man, or any one, into trouble in that age.

He assailed the doctrine of the Trinity as a scholastic invention of the Middle Ages, and, after dealing with the old-fashioned metaphysical subtleties, described it as "conceived in ignorance, brought forth and maintained by cruelty." It was a mere human invention, unknown to the primitive church, "neither was it believed by the primitive saints or thus stated by any I have read of in the first, second, or third centuries." God, he said, was "not to be divided, but [was] one pure, entire, and eternal being, who in the fulness of time sent forth his Son as the true light." Afterwards, at the close of the pamphlet, he added, "Mistake me not; we never have disowned a Father, Word, and Spirit, which are one, but [we disown] men's inventions."

This was in a general way what the Quakers believed on this subject. They held that although the three persons were mentioned in the Scriptures and declared to be one, yet the complicated doctrine of the Trinity, as stated in the Athanasian creed, was never heard of until three hundred years after Christ. They preferred, they said, the statement of the Scriptures to the statement of the school-men. They accepted the simple account in the New Testament that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were one; but they rejected the scholastic doctrine that the three were each separate and distinct persons and substances, and yet also one. Such idle metaphysics, they said, tended not to

righteousness, and were unknown to the primitive Christians.

In the second part of the "Sandy Foundation" Penn attacked the commonly received doctrine of the atonement, which held that mankind had been saved from the infinite and unforgiving wrath of God only by the infliction of all that wrath and vengeance on Christ, who in his death wholly paid for the unforgivable sins of man, past, present, and to come. Penn ridiculed this doctrine as inconsistent with numerous passages of Scripture which describe God as merciful, loving, and righteous, and as in itself absurd and contrary to reason; for remission of sins and salvation came by faith, obedience, and good works.

This was another fundamental doctrine of the early Quakers. They carried their belief in the inner light so far as to hold that the appearance of Christ on the earth was solely to confer his spirit—that is, the inner light—on all men. The only Christ they worshipped was the spiritual Christ in each heart. His sufferings and death as man were simply incidents of his earthly life, and not fit subjects for worship. They held that it was his spirit that would save mankind, and not the shedding of his blood or any mere act or event of his life; that he came to save men by giving them a spiritual principle that would change their hearts; that the idea of it being necessary, in order to save mankind, that Christ should be sacrificed and tortured was a mere material and vulgar notion, unworthy of belief and inconsistent with any sense of justice on the part of God.

This opinion seems to have been held by the majority of Quakers for over a hundred and fifty years without any serious dissent from it. But a party was slowly growing up among them which inclined to return to the old form of the doctrine of the atonement, and by the year 1827, this party had become a majority of all the Quakers in England and America. There was a great controversy over the question, and a separation followed. The majority became known as the Orthodox Quakers, while those who held to the doctrine of Penn and the early leaders of the sect were called Hicksites.*

The last part of Penn's "Sandy Foundation" assailed that familiar doctrine of the time that men could be justified in the sight of God, not by their good works, but only by the righteousness of Christ being imputed to them. This was a much worn subject of controversy, and the numerous small and radical sects which were being absorbed by the Quakers were very strenuous in maintaining that imputed righteousness was an absurdity, and that a man could be justified or sanctified only by his own acts of righteousness or innocency.

Penn had now attained what must have been a considerable part of his youthful ambition. He had succeeded in stating, with fully detailed arguments, some of the most fundamental principles of the new faith which had aroused his enthusiasm. As an educated man he must have felt the need of such a

* Janney's History of the Friends, vol. iv. chaps. vi., viii., xiv.; The Making of Pennsylvania, p. 50.

printed statement,—something that would be more durable and more of a record than street- or field-preaching, or a furious verbal controversy with Presbyterians amid hisses, mockery, and violence. He had become, in fact, the first Quaker theologian.

As we read the "Sandy Foundation," it is easy to see that it was written with thoroughness and care. Pepys says, "I find it so well writ as I think it is too good for him ever to have writ it; and it is a serious sort of book and not fit for everybody to read." † Its youthful author must have been a diligent student of theology, and familiar with all the abstruseness of the religious controversies of the time. But he was very young to be doing such a thing, for he was only twenty-four years old.

We must remember, however, that in the fluid state of religious opinion, and in the strange religious excitement which had set everybody rushing to and fro, it was easy for youthful ardor, if backed by any ability at all, to produce an impression.

The arguments of his pamphlet are now the accepted belief of millions. The substance of the faith of the early Quakers was that they liked to believe that Christ was divine without being obliged to state his divinity in the form of a metaphysical subtlety. They liked to believe that he came to save the world, but in a spiritual sense, and not merely by means of death and suffering. This general spiritual idea of his divinity has now spread to every division of Christendom, and is the most sin-

† Vol. viii. p. 227.

cere form of belief on the subject held in modern times. Millions of men and women who announce themselves as Trinitarians mean only that they believe in a general way in the divinity of Christ. Few of them care for the doctrine of the Trinity as taught in the Middle Ages, and few of them could even state it.

But it was a daring thing to announce such belief in the year 1668. Such doctrine might possibly pass unnoticed in a field-preacher, but printed and circulated with an educated man's name attached it was an atrocious crime. The Bishop of London saw in Penn's pamphlet what to him was a flat denial of the divinity of Christ, and that was a crime by act of Parliament. Penn was forthwith arrested and sent to the Tower, where for nine months the powerful influence that could be exerted in favor of a cavalier was unable to release him.

He had in truth committed a very serious offence, and for some time he was imprisoned with such rigor that his friends could not see him. He was informed that "the bishop was resolved that he should publicly recant or die a prisoner." To this he replied,—

"All is well: I wish they had told me so before, since the expecting of a release put a stop to some business; thou mayst tell my father, who I know will ask thee, these words: that my prison shall be my grave, before I will budge a jot; for I owe my conscience to no mortal man; I have no need to fear; God will make amends for all; they are mistaken in me; I value not their threats and resolutions, for they shall know I can weary out their malice and peevishness, and in me shall they all behold a resolution above fear; conscience above cruelty, and a baffle put to all their designs

by the spirit of patience, the companion of all the tribulated flock of the blessed Jesus, who is the author and finisher of the faith that overcomes the world, yea, death and hell too. Neither great nor good things are ever attained without loss and hardships. He that would reap and not labor, must faint with the wind and perish in disappointments; but an hair of my head shall not fall without the Providence of my Father that is over all."

So, like Sir Walter Raleigh and John Bunyan, he settled down to writing a book while in prison, and prepared his most famous work, "No Cross, No Crown." The title was an excellent one and has prolonged the life of the book, which is the only one of Penn's writings that is still sometimes republished. It shows the strange religiousness of that age when liberty was new. Its thoughts have been thrashed over by millions of Christian preachers again and again in our time, and seem commonplace enough, for Christianity has accepted the spiritual movement which Penn and the Quakers were starting and carried it far beyond anything they dreamed of. But it was a new thing then to insist so absolutely on good works as against blind faith, and on spirituality as against dogmas and ceremonies. It was a new thing to speak of the cross, not as an outward symbol, but as an inward light. It was startling to be told that all religion could take place within the soul, and not in a church or confessional box.

George Fox relates that when he first declared that a church was not a building, not lime and stone, but a spiritual body, his hearers were so amazed that they broke up the meeting. They were beside themselves with the astonishment of men who have heard something which secretly com-

forts and delights them, but which they dare not accept.

In "No Cross, No Crown" Penn, of course, argued strongly for primitive Christianity, and protested in Puritan fashion against the corruptions of the times, the balls, masks, and feasting, pride, avarice, and luxury. All these things could be mitigated only by Quaker spirituality, the cultivation of the inward light and the refusal to encourage human pride by pulling off the hat, bowing, and giving fulsome titles.

But the advocacy of the special principles of the Quakers forms a very small portion of the book. It was in reality a strong appeal to the general religious sentiment of mankind without regard to creed, an appeal to the growing spirituality which has become the modern religion in place of dogma; and it is this quality which causes it still to be occasionally republished.

If it had been well written it would have been a wonderful book. But, unfortunately, Penn wrote in a diffuse, wordy, dull way, which obscured and crippled the really great ideas he had in his soul.

In the second part of "No Cross, No Crown," which seems to have been written some years afterwards, Penn cites the sayings of about eighty famous men of the ancient and classical world, and of about sixty of later times, to show how all the great and wise, heathen and Christians, without regard to sect, testified in favor of pure spiritual righteousness and good works as the only true religion.

These citations show that in his youth Penn must have been an omniverous reader and spent much

time in libraries. His handling of the innumerable texts he cites shows great familiarity with the Bible. Indeed, it is impossible to read his works without concluding that although he had no great gift of literary expression, yet he was a man fully informed in the knowledge of his day and most painstaking and thorough in his researches and preparation.

Meanwhile, however, he remained in prison and was assailed in pamphlets and from pulpits as a seducer, heretic, and blasphemer, for whom the vengeance of the Great Day was reserved. He wrote a letter to the secretary of state, Lord Arlington, asking to be released, because his imprisonment was illegal. He had had no trial; he had not been heard in his own defence; and then he went on to argue on the injustice and impolicy of punishing people for their religious opinions. "Force," he says, "may make hypocrites, but it can never make converts." The close of his letter was spirited enough for any cavalier.

"I make no apology for my letter, as a trouble—the usual style of suppliants; because I think the honor that will accrue to thee by being just and releasing the opprest, exceeds the advantage that can succeed to me."

This is one of the instances in which Penn used the offensive thee and thou language in a public letter to an official. But he was on his metal and very much excited at this time. He expected to be called up for examination on his heresy, or given some sort of trial in which he would have a chance to explain his position more fully and at the same time assist the cause of his sect. But the

Bishop of London and the government, thoroughly accustomed as they were to religious controversies, had no intention of giving the ambitious young man such a grand opportunity to display himself. They hoped to wean him from his delusion by severity and personal influence. The influence was supplied by his father and Bishop Stillingfleet, who visited him, and Penn afterwards described how they worked upon him.

"As I saw very few, so I saw them but seldom, except my own father and Dr. Stillingfleet, the present Bishop of Worcester. The one came as my relation, the other at the king's command, to endeavor my change of judgment. But as I told him, and he told the king, that the Tower was the worst argument in the world to convince me, for whoever was in the wrong those who used force for religion, never could be in the right—so neither the Doctor's arguments, nor his moving and interesting motives of the king's favor and preferment, at all prevailed; and I am glad I have the opportunity to own so publicly the great pains he took, and humanity he showed, and that to his moderation, learning, and kindness, I will ever hold myself obliged." (Memoirs, Penna. Hist. Soc., vol. iii. part ii. p. 239.)

Finding that he was not to be publicly examined or allowed to defend himself, Penn finally decided to write a pamphlet showing that he had not denied the divinity of Christ. He called this new production "Innocency with her Open Face," and in it he announced most unequivocally his belief in the divinity, and maintained by citations of Scripture and argument the Quaker position, which, while expressly admitting the divinity, rejected the complicated scholastic doctrine of the Trinity and imputed righteousness.

This pamphlet secured his release, or rather gave

a ground-work on which his friends could help him. His father, as we have shown, had strong claims on the gratitude of the Duke of York, and the duke interceded with the king.

Penn, who never forgot a favor or a kindness, and with whom gratitude was a lifelong sentiment, ever afterwards considered himself bound to the duke by the strongest feeling of friendliness. It was by no means the last of the duke's favors, and Penn's increasing attachment to him was not altogether fortunate in later years.

Penn, now a free man once more, could look back with some satisfaction on his nine months' imprisonment. In the religious conflicts of that time imprisonment was a test of sincerity and fitness. It had to be endured with a serene and high spirit. Religious belief had for many years been measured by its advocates' willingness to die at the stake or on the gallows; and the people had nothing but contempt for religion of any other kind. A small sect that flinched at the stake or the jail became a laughing stock and went out of existence.

Penn had done what George Fox could also so effectually do. He had not merely endured his imprisonment with a spirit that won the respect both of his followers and his enemies, but he had made the imprisonment a means of advancing the cause he had at heart, of making it known to the world in a way that would arouse enthusiasm. He had stated more fully and completely than had yet been done the fundamental doctrines of his faith in his two pamphlets, "The Sandy Foundation" and "Inno-

cency with her Open Face;" and these two pamphlets, the one that imprisoned him and the one that released him, are to this day the authorities used to prove the original doctrines of the Quakers.

When we add to these two pamphlets his book, "No Cross, No Crown," which has also a permanent value, we have Penn's three most important works; and it was a good deal to be accomplished within a twelvemonth by a young man of only twenty-four, who had spent most of that time locked up in the Tower.

IX

TRIAL BY JURY AND HAT HONOR

Among the persons whose respect Penn won by his imprisonment was his father, the admiral. But the father's relenting was slight. The little intercourse he had with his son was still formal and severe. While the son had been going through his year of controversy and imprisonment, the admiral had had troubles of his own; for it was in that year that he was impeached as already described, and prevented from going to sea in command of the fleet. In addition to that annoyance and disappointment, he was now laid up with a bad attack of the gout.

But he relented so far as to request that Penn should go back to Ireland and again take charge of the family estate. He would not, however, condescend to make this request directly; it was made to the wayward son through his mother. "If you are ordained to be another cross to me," said the admiral, when he at last consented to write to his son, "God's will be done, and I shall arm myself the best I can against it."

Penn was in Ireland on this occasion for about a year, and in the intervals of business seems to have found ample time for very substantial service to the people of his faith. On his arrival he found nearly all the Quakers of the town of Cork in prison. "The

jail," he says, had become "a meeting-house and a workhouse, for they would not be idle anywhere."

Jealousy in trade, he found, had combined with religious hatred to accomplish this persecution. He prepared a general statement of their case, and with the assistance of his friends laid the matter before the lord lieutenant at Dublin, and soon he had the satisfaction of obtaining an order of council for the release of his people. This was the first time he had succeeded in effecting a release of this kind, and it was a sort of business of which he did a good deal in after years.

It is curious to find him, in a public letter he prepared, "To the young convinced," arguing for that quietude and silent contemplation which was one of the foundation principles of his sect. Let us not, he says, "enter into many reasonings with opposers." He certainly had not been living up to this standard himself, and he was soon to be thrown into still fiercer controversy.

The leaders of the Quakers do not, as we read about their doings, have the appearance of quietists. They hit as hard and used as violent language as their opponents; and it would have been difficult for them to have maintained themselves in any other way. Doubtless, however, they enjoyed many intervals when they could cultivate the inner light by serene contemplation. A few months in prison would give abundant opportunities; and the rank and file who were not called upon to write or preach could live closer to the ideal standard.

In 1670 Penn returned to London, where, either

because he had conducted the Irish business well or because his father saw no use in holding out longer, a complete reconciliation took place between them.

In this same year, because the infection of Quaker doctrine seemed to be growing worse, it was decided to use against them more strenuously the famous Conventicle Act which had been passed in 1664. This act made unlawful any meetings for worship other than those of the Church of England; the magistrates were allowed to fine and imprison without trial by jury, and informers were given one-third of the fines. It was an arbitrary, despotic law, in clear violation of the principles of English liberty.

The punishment of the Quakers was always in progress at this period. Every month proceedings were begun in the various counties as the magistrates and officials obtained evidence, or thought that they had a jury that would convict, and fines and imprisonments were inflicted. But in this year, 1670, the work of suppression was particularly active, and it was inevitable that Penn, in spite of the importance of his family, must sooner or later be brought within its sweep.

He had gone, it seems, one day in August, to the meeting-house in Gracechurch Street or Gracious Street, as it was sometimes called, in London, and, finding the doors guarded by soldiers, he and some other Quakers held a silent meeting standing before the door. He was soon moved to speak, and immediately the constables who were on the watch seized him.

Brought before the mayor, he was roughly handled by that official, who told him he "should have his hat pulled off, for all he was Admiral Penn's son." He would send him to Bridewell, he said, and see him whipped; and he went on abusing the admiral, repeating some of the current charges of the day against him, and accusing him of starving the sailors. The authorities made a good haul that day, and besides the Quakers they captured a number of Independents and Baptists.

Penn was confined at the sign of the Black Dog, in Newgate Market, whence he wrote an affectionate letter to his father. "I am very well," he says, "and have no trouble upon my spirits, besides my absence from thee, especially at this juncture, but otherwise I can say, I was never better; and what they have to charge me with is harmless."

Soon afterwards he and William Mead, who was arrested with him, were brought to trial on an indictment charging them with preaching to an unlawful assembly, and causing a great concourse and tumult to the disturbance of the king's peace and the great terror of many of his liege subjects. A full account of the trial, which was held in the Old Baily during the first five days of September, 1670, may now be found in the first volume of Penn's works, and a few quotations from it will show the rough method of that time in administering criminal justice. Accused persons were not then, or, indeed, for a long time afterwards, allowed counsel to defend them.

The trial was conducted principally by the recorder of London, and there were on the bench with

him to compose the court, the mayor, five aldermen, and three sheriffs. When Penn and Mead entered the room wearing their hats, the officers, it seems, pulled them off. But the court, according to the report of the trial, did not choose to be deprived of its sport.

"*Mayor.*—Sirrah, who bid you put off their hats? Put on their hats again.

"*Observer.*—Whereupon one of the officers, putting the prisoners' hats upon their heads (pursuant to the order of the Court), brought them to the bar.

"*Recorder.*—Do you know where you are?

"*Penn.*—Yes.

"*Recorder.*—Do you know it is the King's court?

"*Penn.*—I know it to be a court, and I suppose it to be the King's court.

"*Recorder.*—Do you know there is respect due to the court?

"*Penn.*—Yes.

"*Recorder.*—Why do you not pay it, then?

"*Penn.*—I do so.

"*Recorder.*—Why do you not put off your hat, then?

"*Penn.*—Because I do not believe that to be respect.

"*Recorder.*—Well, the court sets forty marks apiece upon your heads, as a fine, for your contempt of the court.

"*Penn.*—I desire it may be observed, that we came into the court with our hats off (that is, taken off), and if they have been put on since, it was by order from the bench; and therefore, not we, but the bench should be fined."

Prisoners not being allowed counsel, the court was supposed to be their counsel and see that they were fairly tried; but the judges handled them very much as French judges still do. They questioned and teased them, and the prisoners' attempts to defend themselves were apt to become unseemly altercations with the judges.

Penn declared that he had only been worshipping

God according to his conscience, and had broken no law, and asked to be shown what law they thought he had broken. The recorder would give only a surly general answer that he had broken the common law, and ordered him to plead to the indictment.

"*Penn.*—Shall I plead to an indictment that hath no foundation in law? If it contain that law you say I have broken, why should you decline to produce that law, since it will be impossible for the jury to determine or agree to bring in their verdict, who hath not the law produced, by which they should measure the truth of this indictment, and the guilt or contrary, of my act.

"*Recorder.*—You are a saucy fellow; speak to the indictment.

"*Penn.*—I say it is my place to speak to matter of law; I am arraigned a prisoner; my liberty, which is next to life itself, is now concerned; you are many mouths and ears against me, and if I must not be allowed to make the best of my case, it is hard, I say again, unless you shew me, and the people, the law you ground your indictment upon, I shall take it for granted, your proceedings are merely arbitrary.

"*Observer.*—(At this time several upon the bench urged, hard upon the prisoner, to bear him down.)

"*Recorder.*—The question is, whether you are guilty of this indictment?

"*Penn.*—The question is not whether I am guilty of this indictment but whether this indictment be legal. It is too general and imperfect an answer, to say it is the common law, unless we know both where and what it is; for where there is no law, there is no transgression, and that law which is not in being, is so far from being common, that it is no law at all.

"*Recorder.*—You are an impertinent fellow; will you teach the Court what law is? It's lex non scripta, that which many have studied thirty or forty years to know, and would you have me tell you in a moment?

"*Penn.*—Certainly, if the common law be so hard to be understood, it's far from being very common; but if the Lord Coke in his Institutes be of any consideration, he tells us that common law is common right; and that common right is the great charter of privileges, confirmed 9 Hen. III. 29; 25 Edw. I. 1; 2 Edw. III. 8; Coke's Insts. 2 p. 56.

"*Recorder.*—Sir, you are a troublesome fellow, and it is not for the honor of the court to suffer you to go on.

"*Penn.*—I have asked but one question, and you have not answered me; though the rights and privileges of every Englishman be concerned in it.

* * * * * * * *

"*Recorder.*—Take him away; my Lord, if you take not some course with this pestilent fellow, to stop his mouth, we shall not be able to do anything to-night.

"*Mayor.*—Take him away, take him away! turn him into the Bale-dock."

Penn stood up sturdily for what he believed to be his rights and the rights of all Englishmen; but we have not space to quote all his arguments, some of which he shouted across the room to the court and jury when removed to the distance of the bale-dock.

When the jury were called upon for their verdict they announced that they found Penn "guilty of speaking in Gracious street." This was, of course, no crime, and the court stormed at them to make their verdict read "guilty of speaking in Gracious Street to an unlawful assembly." But they would go no further than to say "guilty of speaking to an assembly in Gracious street;" and neither the threats of the court nor two days' starvation would induce them to put in the word unlawful. It was, of course, their covert way of mocking at the court and attacking the law and policy that attempted to suppress the worship of dissenters.

They were sent out again and again, but every time they returned with the same mock verdict. At each of their returns there would be discussion, savage threats from the bench, and protests from Penn.

"*Penn.*—It is intolerable that my jury should be thus menaced; is this according to the fundamental law? Are not they my proper judges by the Great Charter of England? What hope is there of ever having justice done when juries are threatened and their verdict rejected?

* * * * * * * *

"*Mayor.*—Stop his mouth; jailor, bring fetters and stake him to the ground.

"*Penn.*—Do your pleasure, I matter not your fetters.

"*Recorder.*—Till now I never understood the reason of the policy and prudence of the Spaniards, in suffering the Inquisition among them; and certainly it will never be well with us till something like the Spanish Inquisition be in England."

After having been kept out two days and two nights without beds or food the jury brought in a verdict of not guilty, which being in regular form, the court was reluctantly obliged to accept it. But the judges were determined to get even with the jury and Penn in another way.

"*Recorder.*—I am sorry, gentlemen, you have followed your own judgment and opinions rather than the good and wholesome advice which was given you. God keep my life out of your hands; but for this the court fines you forty marks a man, and imprisonment till paid; at which Penn stept forward towards the bench, and said:

"*Penn.*—I demand my liberty, being freed by the jury.

"*Mayor.*—No, you are in for your fines.

"*Penn.*—Fines for what?

"*Mayor.*—For contempt of the court.

"*Penn.*—I ask if it be according to the fundamental laws of England, that any Englishman should be fined or amerced but by the judgment of his peers or jury? since it expressly contradicts the fourteenth and twenty-ninth chapter of the Great Charter of England which says, No freeman ought to be amerced, but by the oath of good and lawful men of the vicinage.

"*Recorder.*—Take him away, take him away, take him out the court.

"*Penn.*—I can never urge the fundamental laws of England but you cry, Take him away, take him away; but 'tis no wonder, since the Spanish Inquisition hath so great a place in the Recorder's heart. God Almighty, who is just, will judge you for all these things."

Both Penn and the jury were thrust into the bale-dock and thence sent to Newgate until they should pay their fines. The jury demanded their freedom every six hours, and, regarding themselves as martyrs, refused to pay the fines.

"I intreat thee," wrote Penn to his father, "not to purchase my liberty. They will repent them of their proceedings. I am now a prisoner notoriously against law." And in another letter, he wrote, "Considering I cannot be free, but upon such terms as strengthening their arbitrary and base proceedings, I shall rather choose to suffer any hardship. . . . My present restraint is so far from being humor, that I would rather perish than release myself by so indirect a course as to satiate their revengeful, avaricious appetites."

It was an interesting picture of the times and of Anglo-Saxon sturdiness,—Penn and the jury vigorously standing by what they believed to be their rights and remaining in the vileness of Newgate when they could have purchased their liberty for a trifle.

It must be confessed, however, that the jury had been not a little contumacious in continually bringing in a mock verdict. It was, of course, their way of showing their contempt for the whole proceeding, and their sympathy for the Quakers and all other dissenters whose worship was interfered with. But they could have shown their contempt just as efficaciously by at once bringing in a verdict of not guilty. It was perhaps right that they should be fined for such irregular conduct. But it was a ques-

tion whether the court could impose the fine without trying them in the usual way before another jury. The court claimed the right to fine without trial, and the obstinacy of Penn's jury in remaining in prison seems to have brought the question to a decision. It was argued at length before the Court of Common Pleas, which decided that the jury's view of the law was sound. The order inflicting their fines was rescinded and they were set at liberty.

Penn's case was somewhat different. If he had insisted on wearing his hat in court after it had been taken off by the officers, the judges would have been right in fining him. Removal of the hat was an act of respect paid in every court of justice, and still paid, for even the Quakers do not now insist on wearing their hats in court. People could not be allowed to appear naked in court or commit any other offensive act and claim exemption from punishment on the ground of religion. But according to the report of the trial Penn's hat was removed by an officer when he came into court, and the court ordered the hat put on again so as to have a chance to badger and fine him for wearing it. This was certainly inexcusable, and Penn was right in protesting against such a fine.

The account we have of the trial was published soon after the trial was held, with a preface and a long appendix, which discussed very fully all the questions of civil liberty involved, and had a great deal to say of Magna Charta and other sources of British freedom. As this account was apparently prepared by the Quakers, it is possible that it may

be too highly colored and too favorable to Penn and Mead. Some one, signing himself "S. S.," wrote an answer to it, attacking Penn's father for stealing prize-money and amassing ill-gotten riches for a conscientious fool of a son, who made such a noise in court that the judge could not charge the jury. As for the Quakers, they were a libelling, lying, discontented people, who would set the country in a flame. When the king seized their meeting-house, they broke in the doors, overpowered the constables, and kicked and spurned the officers who attempted to break up their unlawful assembly. Against this attack Penn wrote a long reply called "Truth Rescued from Imposture;" and, reading all these three documents together, it does not seem that the original Quaker report of the trial is at all seriously impugned.

The publication of the report and the sturdy conduct of Penn and William Mead, as described in it, were unquestionably useful. It was another effort in the long struggle of Anglo-Saxon liberty; and although it is not possible to point to any specific change in criminal trials as the result of it, yet, together with the other protests, it gradually, in the course of years, educated public opinion and wrought the improvement which has now long been enjoyed in all English-speaking countries.

How long Penn and Mead might have remained in prison as a protest against their arbitrary judges we cannot say; for Penn's father brought the imprisonment to a speedy termination. The admiral's health was rapidly declining. In his irritated and

anxious state he could no longer bear the annoyance of his son's imprisonment, and he could not bear the thought of dying without seeing him. The question of principle which seemed of so much importance to the son was in the father's eyes a silly sentiment. So, in spite of the son's protest, the father paid his fine and also that of William Mead, and they were at once set free.

When Penn reached home he found that his father had only a few days to live. Their meeting must have been an affecting one. The admiral had been thinking what terrible things might happen in the future to his stubborn offspring, who had such a passion for making a martyr of himself in loathsome prisons. He had accordingly sent a friend to the Duke of York to make his dying request that the duke would watch over his son and intercede with the king when necessary for his protection. Both the duke and the king sent back the kindest answers and promises, which must have greatly relieved the dying admiral ; and these promises were afterwards fulfilled to the letter.

The admiral could no longer quarrel with his son ; natural affection had got the better of all other feelings. But the low spirits and irritation which accompany the gout turned his mind to despondency and melancholy. He seemed to be no longer the cavalier admiral and courtier. He declaimed against the wickedness and impurity of the age like a Puritan and prophesied judgments upon England for the dissolute and profane lives of her gentry and nobility. His son describes him as very repentant.

"Son William, I am weary of the world. I would not live over my days again if I could command them with a wish; for the snares of life are greater than the fears of death. This troubles me that I have offended a gracious God.

"The thought of that has followed me to this day. Oh! have a care of sin! It is that which is the sting both of life and death. Three things I commend to you:

"*First.*—Let nothing in this world tempt you to wrong your conscience; so you will keep peace at home, which will be a feast to you in the day of trouble.

"*Secondly.*—Whatever you design to do, lay it justly and time it seasonably, for that gives security and despatch.

"*Lastly.*—Be not troubled at disappointments, for if they may be recovered, do it; if they cannot, trouble is vain. If you could not have helped it, be content; there is often peace and profit in submitting to Providence: for afflictions make wise. If you could have helped it, let not your trouble exceed instruction for another time.

"These rules will carry you with firmness and comfort through this inconstant world."

The admiral died on the 16th of September, 1670, and with almost his last breath said to his son,—

"If you and your friends keep to your plain way of preaching and to your plain way of living, you will make an end of the priests to the end of the world. Bury me by my mother. Live in love. Shun all manner of evil, and I pray God to bless you all, and he will bless you."

X

PENN BECOMES RICH, AND ALSO, THEY SAID, A DANGEROUS MAN

At his father's death Penn came into possession of a handsome estate. At least, so we are informed by that old biography by Besse, much relied upon by all subsequent biographers, and prefixed to the edition of Penn's writings published in 1726, not long after his death. His subsequent biographer, Clarkson, goes a step farther, and fixes the value of this estate as yielding an income of at least fifteen hundred pounds a year. Clarkson gives no authority, and his statement is probably only a guess or some tradition he had heard among the Quakers. If it is correct, Penn was one of the rich young men of his day, for fifteen hundred pounds a year was easily the equivalent of thirty thousand dollars a year in our time.

Penn had a younger brother and a sister, and his mother was also still living. As the eldest son he may have had the largest share of the family estate; but if the mother and the other two children were in any way suitably provided for, the admiral had attained one of the great ambitions of his life,—the accumulation of a family fortune.

But, independently of the exact amount of his income, we know from several contemporary sources

that Penn's fortune was regarded at that time as a rather large one. He, indeed, once described himself as a man "of great acquaintance and plentiful estate." He was reviled and ridiculed by cavaliers as a youth of ability, opportunities, and wealth, who was fooling them all away with the silly Quakers.

"I vow Mr. Penn I am sorry for you," said Sir John Robinson, the lieutenant of the Tower; "you are an ingenious gentleman, all the world must allow you and do allow you that, and you have a plentiful estate. Why should you render yourself unhappy by associating with such a simple people?"

"I confess," replied Penn, "I have made it my choice to relinquish the company of those that are ingeniously wicked, to converse with those that are more honestly simple."

And, indeed, neither the death of his father nor the sudden possession of a large, independent fortune checked him for a moment in his efforts for the honestly simple folk, as he called them, whose faith he had made his own. Almost immediately after his father's death he challenged to public controversy a Baptist preacher named Ives. This Ives had in one of his sermons attacked both Penn and the Quakers; and to call him to account and answer him would, according to the standard of those times, advance the Quaker cause.

A meeting was arranged at Wycombe; but Ives himself did not appear. His brother came to defend the Baptists, and, according to the rules of these religious duels, he, as representing the assailant, was obliged to speak first. He brought with him a speech ready prepared, which when he had delivered he immediately left the house accompanied by some

of his followers. This was an old trick, and often a very effective one. The design was to state his own side, and then by his sudden departure in the heat of his speech carry away enough of the audience to leave his opponent speaking to empty benches. It is easy to see how a fervid clap-trap orator might be very successful in this, and turn the other side into a laughing-stock for the whole county.

But Ives, it seems, was not sufficiently fervid ; for, according to the account the Quakers have given of this controversy, most of the people remained to hear Penn, and were so well pleased with him that they were disgusted with Ives when he returned to upbraid them for remaining.

Penn at this time seems to have been travelling through the counties of Bucks and Oxford preaching and assisting the Quakers ; and he soon found a more important person to attack than the tricky Ives. He was near the great university from which he had been expelled for his religion, and he found that the students who inclined towards Quakerism were treated worse than ever. The vice-chancellor, as the Quaker historians inform us, employed spies to go among the Quakers and Baptists and lead them to express themselves incautiously or in a way that might be construed as traitorous language.

No doubt this vice-chancellor, like many other Royalists at that time, may have had an honest suspicion that the Quakers would in the end become a dangerous political party and attempt the overthrow of the government. They were so radical and so

strange in their opinions and conduct, so fearless and desperate, that they might become Fifth Monarchy men or worse. No doubt, also, the Quakers, when smarting under the punishments of the law, used severe language about government and authority, so that the detectives of those times might easily collect what would seem to be very strong evidence of dangerous political intentions.

Penn, however, saw in the vice-chancellor only a ferocious beast that was persecuting his people, and he wrote a letter telling him so, in language which is not now usually used by graduates in addressing the chancellor of their alma mater. He used thee and thou; for this was one of the occasions when he intended to be offensive.

"Shall the multiplied oppressions which thou continuest to heap upon innocent English people for their peaceable religious meetings pass unregarded by the Eternal God? Dost thou think to escape his fierce wrath and dreadful vengeance for thy ungodly and illegal persecution of his poor children? I tell thee, no. Better were it for thee hadst thou never been born. Poor mushroom, wilt thou war against the Lord, and lift up thyself in battle against the Almighty? Canst thou frustrate his holy purposes, and bring his determination to nought? He has decreed to exalt himself by us, and to propagate his gospel to the ends of the earth."

In this same year he wrote a pamplet against the Roman church called "A Seasonable Caveat against Popery." It was an answer to a pamphlet called "An Explanation of the Roman Catholic Belief;" and yet his motive for this attack on the Romanists is not clear, unless he was trying to offset the charge that he was a Jesuit. The Quakers were continually being called Jesuits, and Penn was

called a Jesuit in disguise for the next twenty or thirty years.

This seems strange at first, but it is easily understood when we consider the condition of things at that time. The secret methods of the Roman church to get possession of the British government were greatly dreaded in England, and the fear of them could at times create a panic. The Quakers were so peculiar, and it was so strange for a rich young cavalier like Penn to join them, that people found difficulty in believing that their oddities were not a cloak for some dark and horrid Jesuit design, some wholesale gunpowder plot.

In his "Caveat" Penn belabored the Romanists and the Jesuits in a way that in the minds of some no doubt freed him from the suspicion of Jesuitism, and in the minds of others confirmed their suspicions. He warned the English people against their ancient enemy, who, from having been partially subdued, was now become more cunning and complaisant than ever. Her doctrine is the doctrine of devils ; her priests, though forbidden to marry, "keep as many strumpets as their purse or lust shall please," while the revenue of the Pope is enhanced by licensing under his own seal the resorts of these debased women. He quotes book and page of the casuists to show how they openly justify fornication, perjury, and theft.

Against transubstantiation he argues, in the rugged manner of the time, that if the bread and wine become the actual flesh and blood of Christ by the mere word of the priest, "the creature (and some-

times a sad one, too) makes his creator, which is nothing short of wretched blasphemy, and the Lord they adore and reverence they eat."

Such violent religious controversy as Penn indulged in with vice-chancellors, Romanists, and Baptists has long since gone out of fashion, and is supposed to be unbecoming a Christian. Dr. Stoughton, one of Penn's biographers, apologizes for the savage way in which his Quaker hero assails his opponents. But such apologies are entirely unnecessary. To fight and struggle for a faith was at that time the price of having it. Toleration and religious liberty in the modern sense were scarcely known. No religion was then respectable except that which came of fighting and suffering; for, as Penn said to Sir John Robinson, "I scorn that religion which is not worth suffering for and able to sustain those that are afflicted for it."

The religion of that time was the religion militant, as the religion of our time is the religion acquiescent. But it would hardly be possible for us now to be so acquiescent and easy if militant men like Penn had not secured for us the religious liberty we enjoy.

Towards the close of this very active year of his life, 1670, Penn was back again in London and went one day to a meeting in Wheeler Street. A sergeant in command of a party of soldiers waited at the door, and as soon as Penn began to preach they rushed in, dragged him down, and he was carried to the Tower. This arrest seems to have been by the special order of Sir John Robinson, the lieutenant of the Tower, who as alderman had been one of the

court that had tried Penn and William Mead when the jury refused to convict them.

In the evening Penn was taken from the Tower by an officer with a file of musqueteers to Sir John Robinson, whom he found in company with some of the others who had composed the court, and they inflicted on their victim an examination from which we have already several times quoted passages. As we read it now it seems like a most wanton, unlawful, and cruel inquisition of an unoffending man. The arrest, too, by soldiers without a sworn warrant, and the imprisonment without trial are very shocking to all modern ideas of civil liberty.

Robinson and the other judges having failed to convict Penn with the jury, were evidently determined to catch him in another trap. But as we are writing history we must not be too quick to accept the statement of the Quakers that the conduct of these judges was mere vindictive wickedness and cruelty. It is more probable that as officials whose careers and livelihood were dependent on the Royalist and Church party then in power, they believed, or, if you will, had deceived themselves into believing, that the Quakers were politically dangerous and that this young cavalier Penn was aspiring to be a sort of Cromwell who would in the end gather about him Puritans, Fifth Monarchy men, and other democratic and radical sects to accomplish unknown purposes of his own. For his own sake as well as for the peace of the government the reckless young fellow should be suppressed.

I do not suggest this as a legal excuse for such a

breach of civil rights as they committed, but I suggest it as a reasonable explanation of their conduct, fully borne out by the questions they asked in the examination. Their main object seems to have been to offer Penn the oath of allegiance, which they knew as a Quaker he might refuse to take, because he professed, or, as they probably thought, pretended, to be opposed to all oaths. So they called on him to swear that he would not on any pretence take arms against the king, and that he did abhor that traitorous position, which the Puritans had so often assumed, of thinking it lawful to take arms against a king who was in error or whose ministers were leading him into error; and they also asked him to swear that he would never attempt any alteration of government either in church or state.

All this he refused to do, so they had full scope to taunt him. He explained that his religion protected him from the necessity of taking such an oath, "for," said he, "if I cannot fight against any man (much less against the king), what need I take an oath not to do it? Should I sware not to do what is already against my conscience to do?"

We can easily understand that from the point of view of the judges this explanation seemed like a mere subtlety. So, while professing to have a kindly feeling for him for his father's sake, they treated him with haughty contempt, sneered at his morality, and reminded him of his wealth and position and the degradation he was bringing on himself; and Penn replied to all this with a manliness which has made this examination very famous in his sect.

But the more ability he showed the more dangerous he seemed, and when he began to talk about liberty of conscience, Robinson said,—

"But you do nothing but stir up the people to sedition; and there was one of your friends that told me you preached sedition and meddled with the government."

To this Penn replied,—

"We have the unhappiness to be misrepresented, and I am not the least concerned therein. Bring me the man that will dare to justify this accusation to my face, and if I am not able to make it appear that it is both my practice and all my friends to instill principles of peace and moderation (and only war against spiritual wickedness, that all men may be brought to fear God and work righteousness), I shall contentedly undergo the severest punishment all your laws can expose me to.

"As for the king, I make this offer, that if any living can make it appear, directly or indirectly, from the time I have been called a Quaker (since from thence you date me seditious), I have contrived or acted anything injurious to his person, or the English government, I shall submit my person to your utmost cruelties, and esteem them all but a due recompense. It is hard that I, being innocent, should be reputed guilty; but the will of God be done. I accept of bad reports as well as good."

But his judges were unconvinced. "You will be the heading of parties and drawing people after you," said Robinson, and he ordered him to be confined in Newgate, at that time the vilest of prisons, where hundreds of Quakers had already been thrust in among felons and pickpockets.

It was a severe imprisonment, and lasted six months. People of means who were confined in Newgate could get away from some of the stench, dirt, and disease by hiring rooms from the keepers. Penn at first tried this; but the jailers were so extor-

tionate and abusive that he left their lodgings and allowed himself to be cast into what he calls "the common stinking jail."

It was a strange situation for a man of his education and accomplishments, and one which we can now hardly realize; and it seems still stranger when we find that while in this horrid confinement he managed to write several religious essays and a very learned pamphlet called "The Great Case of Liberty of Conscience once more briefly Debated and Defended by the Authority of Reason, Scripture, and Antiquity."

The chief object of this pamphlet seems to have been to argue against the steadily increasing belief that the Quakers were disseminators of sedition and nourished secret designs against the government. This belief Penn said was a mere supposition founded on nothing stronger than conjecture. The Quaker meetings were open to every one; they were usually very numerously attended; and how could plots and sedition be hatched in such great meetings? He defied any one to bring forward the slightest proof of any preaching at these meetings hostile to authority; and he declared for himself and his people that they held no principle destructive of government, and were ready to engage by God's assistance to lead peaceable, just, and industrious lives. But if this statement was discredited, and the cruel punishments were continued, they would nevertheless hold their meetings to the bitter end in spite of punishment.

For general liberty of conscience to every one he argued in a way which seems very tedious and un-

necessary now that we have so long enjoyed entire freedom in religion. He argued for it on minute grounds of reason, of natural right, of policy, and of morals. Persecution was inconsistent with the Reformation and inconsistent with the protests against the cruelty of the Roman church. It was also a serious injury to trade and commerce and the growth of population. So many families were being broken up and ruined, and so much property destroyed by persecution, that the development of the country was seriously checked; and, as he usually did in these discussions, he gave Holland as a remarkable instance of a country that had greatly increased its trade and power by granting liberty. He quoted, also, the sayings of innumerable sages and saints of all periods of history in favor of liberty; and he discussed, also, the passages of scripture that favored it. He must have had books brought to him in prison, or else he had had these quotations by him for some time, for like the quotations in "No Cross, No Crown," they imply a great deal of reading and access to a good library.

XI

REST AND A SWEETHEART

WHEN Penn was discharged from Newgate after his six months' imprisonment he travelled for a time in Holland and Germany; and no doubt Sir John Robinson and the other judges congratulated themselves on having broken up the dangerous plans of the foolish young cavalier and weaned him from his delusion.

The reasons for his journey are unknown. Possibly, as he found he was so seriously suspected of political intentions, he may have thought it would be well to go away for a time and let the suspicions die out. Perhaps, too, his health had suffered, and he needed a change. For three years he had led a very strenuous life of controversy, preaching and writing, and half of those three years had been passed in loathsome prisons.

He has left us no account of this journey, as he did of a subsequent one to the same countries; but from the few scraps of information we have about it, he seems to have been still following his great mission. There were people in those countries who were in the Seeker state of mind, disgusted with the corruption of religion which they saw around them, and already tinged with the first principles of Quakerism. Possibly, they were not at this time so

GULI SPRINGETT, PENN'S FIRST WIFE

numerous as they afterwards became, or Penn would have had more to say about them.

At Emden, however, he found a physician named Hasbert in a receptive state of mind, and through him ten other people of the town held a silent meeting in the doctor's house. But this strange worship roused terrible suspicions, and these unfortunate converts were afterwards banished over and over again, and stripped of their property.

It is not likely that Penn made many such converts on his journey, and his time was probably largely passed in investigating the religious conditions of the people in his liberal way, a study which had always strongly attracted him; but apparently he did not find much that was pleasing to him.

On his return to England, in the autumn of 1771, there seems to have been a pause in the aggressive activity which had been his characteristic before his journey to Holland; and from a letter which his most recent biographer, Dr. Stoughton, has unearthed in the Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, it is probable that he was looking about for a permanent residence, with a view of marrying Guli Springett, a very pretty Quaker maiden who had captured his fancy. In spite of the ferocious religious controversy, the preaching, the jury trials, and the imprisonments, there had been a romance, a touch of human tenderness amidst the hardness of conflict and the dry spirituality of religion. It was time; for he was twenty-seven years old.

Guli, or Gulielma Maria Springett, as she would

perhaps prefer to be called by a writer of the world's people, was the daughter of a very gallant young Puritan officer, who at the age of only twenty-three found himself on his death-bed at the siege of Bamber. His young wife was hastening to him through difficulties and perils ; and the story of her devotion and his tender farewell, as described in "The Penns and the Penningtons," is doubly beautiful because it is a relief to find that there was at that time anything in England besides hard intolerance, devilish cruelty, and ribald conversation.

Guli was born a few weeks after her father thus died. Her mother soon, like many others, became very unsettled in religion, and could endure neither the formal prayers of the Church of England nor the whining cant of the Puritans. While in this state of mind she met with Isaac Pennington, whom she found to be also a Seeker who could find nothing in all the religions of the time but deceit. They were married, and shortly discovered that the Quaker faith was what they sought ; and Guli also became a Quaker.

They were people of means. Pennington's father had been a Puritan alderman in the civil wars, and one of the court for the trial of Charles I. They lived contentedly at Chalfont in Buckinghamshire until they suddenly became one of those families whose ruin Penn said was impoverishing and depopulating England. Pennington was thrown into prison for his opinions, and his wife and Guli had to wander about as best they could until he was released.

It was after their sufferings had begun that Penn first knew them. John Ellwood, Milton's friend, lived with them, and he has left us a quaint and serious description of Guli as "in all respects a very desirable woman, whether regard was had to her outward person, which wanted nothing to render her completely comely, or to the endowments of her mind, which were every way extraordinary." A fair fortune would go with her, an accompaniment which lovers do not usually refuse. She had, indeed, many suitors of all ranks and conditions; but, as the excellent Ellwood tells us, she bore herself "with so much evenness of temper, such courteous freedom, guarded with the strictest modesty, that none were unduly encouraged, nor could any complain of offence." A very tantalizing young woman she certainly was, and it seems that Ellwood himself was a little touched.

Being the child of parents who could love with devotion, Guli herself was no doubt a strenuous heroic little soul. Penn could attract her, for she could see in him a Quaker hero who feared not the face of man.

Unfortunately the children she bore were not what we should expect from either Penn or her. Heredity often plays queer tricks just at the time when you look for a sure result. Penn's heirs who became the owners of the great commonwealth of Pennsylvania were the children of his second wife, a less lovely woman than Guli; and to this day there are Pennsylvanians who regret that they could not be ruled in colonial times by Guli's sons.

But all that came afterwards. Let us be content that now in the spring of 1672 Penn and Guli were married and settled down at Rickmansworth in Hertfordshire, far from the dirt and turmoil of London, with its terrible Tower and foul Newgate. They were rich and could live at ease, and they seem to have been very happy lovers as long as Guli lived.

The terrors of persecution had for a time passed away. Charles II. had issued a sort of document always detested by the sturdy Anglo-Saxons even when it relieved them from suffering. He called it a Declaration of Indulgence, and in it he arrogantly announced that by virtue of his supreme authority he dispensed with, or, in plain English, abrogated and annulled, for the time being, all the penal laws against Quakers, Presbyterians, Romanists, and other dissenters from the Church of England.

Although he outwardly conformed to the Church of England, Charles was at heart and in secret a Romanist, and his brother, the Duke of York, was now openly one. Charles had, two years before, signed a secret treaty with Louis XIV. of France, by which he agreed to make public his profession of the Roman faith, to assist Louis in destroying the power of Holland, and to support the claims of the House of Bourbon to the Spanish throne. In return for this Louis had agreed to supply Charles with money and to help him with an army to suppress any insurrection that might arise among his subjects. In other words, Charles, like his predecessors, wished to make himself independent of Parliament. He wished, if possible, to govern without Parliament, and this base

treaty with France was to help him to attain that end.

The Declaration of Indulgence was also calculated for the same end. It, of course, relieved the Roman Catholics as well as the Quakers and Puritans from the penal laws, and thus assisted the king's secret Catholic friends and gratified the Catholic king of France. But it performed also the more important function of creating a precedent for ruling without Parliament. It relieved the people from very oppressive laws ; and they could hardly refuse to take the benefit of it ; and that put them at once in the position of assenting to the king's power to abrogate and annul laws as he pleased. In a few years this became a very momentous question and one with which Penn was closely concerned.

But at present, while he was enjoying his first year of married happiness, he had nothing to say about the Declaration of Indulgence. He was probably glad enough to see the hapless Quakers come trooping out of the dismal prisons. Over four hundred of them came out into the light of day and were restored to their families.

Most of the spring of the year 1672 Penn seems to have spent in the enjoyment of his honeymoon. In the summer he again resumed his preacher's life, —that is to say, the life of a Quaker preacher, who serves without pay, is under no orders or compulsion, and may have some other occupation that requires most of his time. During his preaching of this summer he travelled through the counties of Kent, Sussex, and Surrey, working hard ; for within

three weeks he and his companion are said to have attended twenty-one meetings, and were much gratified at the increasing numbers and earnestness of their people.

The traditions of Penn which Clarkson collected among the Quakers in England describe him as a very hard-working minister. He worked hard, in fact, at all his undertakings. Though a learned man, he preached, it is said, in very simple language, easy to be understood. He was not eloquent, because under the peculiar restrictions against vanity and excitement which the Quakers place on preaching, as on all their actions, eloquence in the usual meaning of the word is unknown among them.

"He was of such humility that he used generally to sit at the lowest end of the space allotted to ministers, always taking care to place above himself poor ministers, and those who appeared to him to be peculiarly gifted. He was also no less remarkable for encouraging those who were young in the ministry. Thomas Story, among many others, witnessed this. 'I had no courage,' says he, 'of my own to appear in public among them (the ministers). I thought, however (on seeing Atkinson's ministry acceptable), that I might also probably go through the meetings without offence, which was the full amount of my expectation or desire there; and that which added much to my encouragement was the fatherly care and behaviour of the ministers in general, but especially of that great minister of the Gospel, and faithful servant of Christ, William Penn, who abounded in wisdom, discretion, prudence, love, and tenderness of affection, with all sincerity, above most in this generation; and, indeed, I never knew his equal.'" (Clarkson's Penn, vol. ii. p. 271.)

These same traditions describe him as very neat though plain in his dress. He usually walked with a cane, and in later life, when dictating to an amanuensis, as was frequently his practice, he would take

the cane in his hand, and, walking up and down the room, would mark by striking it against the floor the emphasis on points which he wished particularly to be noticed.

Everything, now that he was happily married, was peaceful. His days of imprisonment seemed to be ended. He had served through them as an apprenticeship to his calling; he had borne himself in them in a way which gave him a standing and influence; and he was now in a position to accomplish some really valuable results. In the following year, 1673, he and his wife travelled in the western part of England, and at Bristol welcomed George Fox on his return from America. It must have been a delightful meeting for the accomplished, learned Penn and his pretty wife. Fox was so unlike them in his education and associations, and yet so full of force, intelligence, and fire, that he must have been perpetually interesting. In his rugged, eloquent way he was full of the enthusiasm of his travels, the adventures and perils of the wilderness, the strange things he had seen, the zeal and steadfastness of the American Quakers, and the great increase and strengthening he now found among those in England. He and the Penns attended the meetings at Bristol and its neighborhood, and Fox describes these meetings as "glorious and powerful."

The Quakers were, indeed, at this time reaping large rewards for their courageous and steady endurance through many years. In our time the religion that draws numbers to itself most effectually is apt to be the one that promises a little social eminence,

that seems to be in the line of fashion and good society. But the Quaker faith was becoming popular because it seemed to arm its followers with fortitude. If it could give such contentment and satisfaction in the midst of suffering, it must, men thought, be true.

For this reason religious people in those days often courted and sought suffering, imprisonment, and even death in a way now difficult to understand. They were often accused, especially the Quakers, of showing too much readiness and eagerness to suffer; cold, philosophical minds would say that, being unduly heated and aroused, they found a morbid satisfaction in suffering which won for them the applause of the world and advanced the cause of their sect.

So many, we are told, from the Presbyterians and other Puritans began to turn towards the Quaker belief that the ministers of those sects bestirred themselves to call back their wandering sheep and to keep others from straying. They wrote pamphlets; and the cleverest of them was called "A Dialogue between a Christian and a Quaker," in which it was assumed that the Quaker was not a Christian at all, and he was made to maintain very ridiculous principles, which were easily confuted.

The life of Penn prefixed to the old edition of his works calls this pamphlet a forgery, because it was put forth as a real discourse which actually happened, and many people believed it to be real. Its author was a Baptist minister, Thomas Hicks, and Penn, to counteract his influence, wrote "The Christian Quaker," a very dull performance as it seems now, but possibly of value in its time. Hicks, at any rate,

continued his attacks, and brought out a second part of his Dialogue, and then a third part, Penn trying to keep pace with him by issuing "Reason against Railing" and "The Counterfeit Christian Detected."

Hicks must have been getting rather the better of Penn, for the Quakers called on Hicks's congregation for a public debate and a chance to clear themselves. The congregation got the advantage by jockeyship, for they forced on the meeting at a time when Penn and Whitehead could not be present, and the vote was overwhelmingly in favor of Hicks.

Penn and Whitehead protested and demanded another meeting, which was finally obtained, and is said to have been attended by six thousand people. This number seems very large, and may be an exaggeration; but we can readily believe that the attendance was large, for in the tumultuous state of religious opinion at that time there was an intense desire to hear these scholastic and metaphysical debates.

The principal Quaker leaders and the principal Baptist leaders were present, and there was one of those extraordinary religious scrimmages which could happen only among the bluff bull-dog English of that period. They debated and shouted at one another all day, running off into strange metaphysical distinctions of the nature of Christ, whether his manhood should be called a part of him or a member of him, of no interest whatever to modern minds, but apparently as fascinating to those people as a theatre or a bull-baiting. No decision was reached, but they enjoyed a good fight; both sides felt better, and had no more to say to one another.

Penn, however, had plenty of other controversies on his hands, for, as that old biography prefixed to his works says of him, he "never turned his back in the day of battle." The Quakers of those days loved a wordy war as much as anybody; and though opposed to fighting with the fleshy arm, never hesitated to describe their argumentative struggles in the metaphores of warfare.

Penn had to answer some author who wrote "The Spirit of the Quakers Tried;" he had to attend tto the case of a pair of pretenders, Reeve and Muggleton, who with their "fond imaginations" drew away much people after them; he had to down John Faldo, who wrote a "Curb to W. Penn's Confidence;" and Harry Hallywell had to be looked after because he wrote "An Account of Familism as it is Revised and Propagated by the Quakers." But Faldo was soon on his feet again, and procured the signatures and approval of "one-and-twenty learned divines" to his book "Quakerism no Christianity," and Samuel Grevil assailed the inward light, and John Perrot, who had attained some distinction among the Quakers, turned renegade and attacked his own people in "The Spirit of the Hat" and in "Tyranny and Hypocrisy Detected." These things and long letters of rebuke to magistrates and of encouragement to the faithful in the Netherlands and in Maryland kept Penn busy enough for two years while he lived in his pleasant country home at Rickmansworth, and learned what a charming woman his young wife was.

XII

PERSECUTION, OATHS, AND CONTROVERSY

THE Declaration of Indulgence, put forth by Charles II., proved to be a very short-lived measure. There was so much opposition to it in Parliament that the king revoked it within a year after it was granted. The mill of persecution began to grind again. The machinery of the courts, the informers, the magistrates, the constables, and the writ-servers started once more on their dismal routine, and Penn was called from his pamphlet-writing and peaceful preaching journeys to take again an active part in trying to protect his people.

The constables broke up a meeting at which he was preaching, and we find him writing a letter of remonstrance to the magistrates, and repeating his old arguments for religious liberty. "Either give us a better faith," he says, "or leave us with the one we have."

George Fox had been one of the first to suffer almost immediately after his return from America. They had caught him in the trap in which they caught so many. They offered him the oath of allegiance, and when he refused it because he could take no oaths of any kind, they imprisoned him without trial as a seditious and dangerous person, an enemy to the government. He was in jail for over

a year on this occasion, suffering severely at times from illness, with his wife rushing about the country to procure influence for his release and returning to the prison to nurse him. The king offered him a pardon; but the Quakers were always obliged to refuse pardons, because their acceptance would imply that they admitted that they had done wrong; and, indeed, the pardons were usually intended to force such an admission.

Penn and the leading Quakers exerted themselves to obtain Fox's release, and Penn went to court, where he had not been for five years. He appealed to his old friend and his father's friend, the Duke of York, and the interview is significant because of the duke's rather fulsome language in favor of liberty of conscience and Penn's relations with him on this subject in after years.

"The time being fixt, we found that gentleman as was agreed, and went with him to the Duke's palace, where he endeavored our admission by the means of the Duchess' Secretary; but the house being very full of people and the Duke of business, the said Secretary could neither procure our nor his own admission; but Colonel Aston, of the bed-chamber, then in waiting, and my old acquaintance and friend (yet I had not seen him in some years before) looking hard at me, thinking he should know me, asked me in the drawing-room, first my name and then my business, and upon understanding both, he presently gave us the favor we waited for, of speaking with the Duke, who came immediately out of his closet to us.

"After something I said as an introduction to the business, I delivered him our request. He perused it, and then told us That he was against all persecution for the sake of religion. That it was true he had in his younger time been warm, especially when he thought people made it a pretence to disturb government, but that he had seen and considered things better, and he was for doing to others as he would have others do unto him; and he thought it would be happy for the world if all were of that mind; for he was sure, he

said, 'that no man was willing to be persecuted himself for his own conscience.' He added that he looked upon us as a quiet industrious people, and though he was not of our judgment, yet he liked our good lives, with much more to the same purpose, promising he would speak to his brother, and doubted not but that the king's counsel would have orders in our friend's favor.

"I and my companion spoke as occasion offered, to recommend both our business and our character, but the less because he prevented us in the manner I have expressed.

"When he had done upon this affair, he was pleased to take a very particular notice of me, both for the relation my father had had to his service in the navy, and the care he had promised him to show in my regard upon all occasions.

"That he wondered I had not been with him, and that whenever I had any business thither, he would order that I should have access; after which he withdrew and we returned.

"This was my first visit to the court after five years' retirement; and this the success of it, and the first time I had spoken with him since '65."

Penn believed that this Roman Catholic duke was entirely sincere in his professions about liberty. Afterwards, when the duke became king, as James II., Penn retained the same confidence. He could never forget the many kindnesses the duke had shown him, and gratitude it seems could easily lead Penn astray. In continuing his account of the interview, he says, "That it should be grateful to me was no wonder; and perhaps, that with some was the beginning of my faults at court."

The duke, however, in spite of his wonderful professions, seems to have done nothing for Fox, who by the exertions of Penn and others was finally discharged on a writ of habeas corpus.

It was about this time that Penn wrote his "Treatise of Oaths." It was an important little book for his sect, because their objection to oaths was bring-

ing them into much difficulty and imprisonment. The book was carefully prepared in Penn's most learned manner, and was in effect issued by the Quakers as a body; for twelve of their principal men signed the preface, which was addressed "To the King and Great Council of England assembled in Parliament."

The argument would not now carry much weight; but as minds were then constituted it was not without influence. His strongest point was perhaps the passage in the New Testament in which the Saviour says, "But I say unto you, Swear not at all." He goes on to argue that it is presumptuous and irreverent to summon God as a witness on every occasion; that it is inconsistent with Christianity, which extirpates in man the perfidiousness which first led to oaths; that it is no safeguard against perjury, since oaths have become so common that they have lost any awe-inspiring influence they may have had; that the form of oath is a superstitious ceremony of kissing a book.

"The use of So help me God, we find from the law of the Almains, of King Clotharius; the laying on of the three fingers above the Book is to signify the Trinity; the thumb and the little finger under the Book are to signify the damnation of body and soul, if they forswear."

The most interesting part of the treatise is the learning it displays. Beginning with the Persians and Scythians, he goes on quoting scores of writers, Greek and Roman, fathers of the church, in every age of history, and succeeds most effectually in showing that a large number of the great and good

men of the past, especially among the early Christians, had the same objections to oath-taking as the Quakers. A few quotations taken at random will show his method.

"Xenocrates was so renowned at Athens for his virtuous life and great integrity that, being called to give his evidence by oath, all the judges stood up and forbade the tender, because they would not have it thought that truth depended more upon an oath than the word of an honest man."

"Menander, the Greek poet, saith, 'Flee an oath though thou shouldst swear justly.'"

"Cherillus saith, oaths bring not credit to the man, but the man must bring credit to the oaths. What serve they for them? To deceive? It seems by this that credit is better than an oath; for it is credit that is security, not the oath."

"Epictetus, a famous and grave Stoic, counselled to refuse an oath altogether."

"Quintilian saith that in time past it was a kind of infamy for grave and approved men to swear."

Ponderous oaths, these ancient sages reasoned, were unnecessary, because in the end you judged of the truth by comparison of circumstances and likelihood. The Quakers were unable to abolish oaths; but they succeeded in greatly modifying their usuage. As time went on statutes were passed allowing Quakers, or any one who wished it, to give his simple affirmation instead of an oath. These statutes prevail now in most English-speaking countries, and thousands who are not Quakers avail themselves of the privilege either because, like the ancient sages and fathers, they think an oath absurd, or because they wish to avoid kissing a dirty, court-room copy of the Bible.

As a collection of all the ancient wisdom on this

question, and as contributing, no doubt, in shaping human conduct, this treatise by Penn is one of the most interesting of his writings.

Soon after he attempted another great stroke for the Quakers and for the British public in "England's Present Interest considered." The present state of England was, he said, one of confusion. It would be hard to find another kingdom of the world so divided within itself on questions of religion. The government had tried to force a uniform belief, and with what result?

"The consequence, whether you intended it or no, through the barbarous practices of those that have had their execution, hath been the spoiling of several thousands of the free born people of this kingdom, of their unforfeited rights. Persons have been flung into gaols, gates and trunks broken open, goods distrained till a stool hath not been left to sit down on; flocks of cattle driven, whole barns full of corn seized, threshed, and carried away; parents left without their children, children without their parents, both without subsistence. . . .

"The widow's mite hath not escaped their hands; they have made her can the forfeiture of her conscience; not leaving her a bed to lie on nor a blanket to cover her. . . . The poor helpless orphan's milk boiling over the fire has been flung to the dogs, and the skillet made part of their prize."

The only remedy for this state of things is, he says, a return to the original Anglo-Saxon liberty by which no man could be disturbed in the possession of his property, every man had a voice and vote in the making of laws, and every man accused of an offence had a right to a fair trial by jury. He goes into the details of this liberty, Magna Charta, the old statutes, and the Anglo-Saxon Wittangemote or free assembly, in the same way as since his day we have had it repeated again and again in histories and school-books.

Then he raises his old subject of liberty of conscience, which he argues out anew as a question of good policy, to give ease to the government from expense, and relieve it of its deadly religious enemies, stop the swarm of paupers and beggars that were every day increasing as the result of persecution, and encourage trade to flourish as Holland's trade had flourished, by granting freedom to religion.

He followed up his argument by a sort of petition to the king and Parliament called "The Continued Cry of the Oppressed," describing the fines and imprisonments, the infamous informers, the rough handling by constables, men and women beaten, carts, ploughs, and crops of the farmers seized, and other sufferings which were still inflicted on the Quakers. These efforts he was making are dull enough to read about nowadays; but they must be mentioned to show his busy life and his consuming passion to advance the cause of liberty and deliver his people from oppression.

That he might be still more busy, Richard Baxter challenged him to a controversy. Baxter had been in the country round Rickmansworth and found it "abounding with Quakers because Mr W Pen, their captain, dwelleth there." He was anxious, he said, to save these poor people from their delusion; so in knight-errant fashion he called on their captain, Penn, to draw and defend. From ten in the morning till five in the afternoon they fought it out before a great crowd of hearers, who went without their dinners, so intent were they to hear the hair-splitting that would now be scarcely understood, and the

rough retorts which would not please a modern religious audience. Nothing was settled; each one claimed the victory, and Penn and Baxter continued the controversy by correspondence, and it was still unsettled.

Penn seemed willing to go on with it forever; for after telling Baxter "the scurvy of the mind is thy distemper, and I fear it is incurable," he says he has great kindness for him, and would like to give him a room in his house, "that I could visit and get discourse with thee in much tender love."

Penn was very active at this time, and seems to have written many pamphlets, some of which do not appear in his works. Several of them had the queer titles of the time, such as "Naked Truth Needs no Shift," which was an answer to "The Quaker's Last Shift Found Out."

XIII

TRAVELS IN HOLLAND AND POLITICS AT HOME

His wife having inherited a house and lands at Worminghurst, in Sussex, Penn left his home at Rickmansworth, and moved to this new estate. Soon afterwards, in company with George Fox, Robert Barclay, and some other leading Quakers, he started on a missionary journey to Holland and Germany. This was in the summer of the year 1677, and since his previous journey, six years before, the Quaker feeling in those countries had been increasing. The Princess Elizabeth, daughter of Frederick V., and the Countess of Hornes had become conspicuously inclined towards the faith of the inward light, and many people were in that seeking state of mind, disgusted with all forms of religion, which had been so fruitful of Quakers in England.

So Penn and his companions set out well supplied with Quaker books in the Dutch and German languages, and Penn kept a journal of their travels and success. It is probable that this journal is the dryest and dullest that ever was written. Penn's generalities became more colorless than ever, and when he gives details they are uninteresting ones. His description of meetings and conversions are always in the same general language of great travail of spirit, precious testimonies, and great awakening. The

mystical expressions used by Quakers are at any time rather meaningless to the uninitiated, and the lapse of two hundred years does not help to make them more intelligible.

But still, by great labor in reading, we gather how they went from town to town encouraging the few congenial souls they found, helping them to organize meetings like those in England, corresponding with and visiting countesses, princesses, and governors of provinces, and Penn had not forgotten his old habit of writing a letter of rebuke to any ruler who had not treated the Quakers well.

In a letter to the King of Poland he pleads for religious liberty and reminds him of a saying of one of his ancestors, Stephen, King of Poland, who had said, "I am king of men, not of consciences; a commander of bodies, not of souls." This striking sentence had long been a favorite quotation with those who sought liberty, and Roger Williams, of Rhode Island, was fond of using it in his controversies with the rulers of Massachusetts.

They passed out of Holland and, entering Germany, travelled through many of the places whence afterwards so many German Mennonites and similar sects allied to the Quakers migrated to Pennsylvania, forming that large body of people still known in our State as the "Pennsylvania Dutch." Evidently a great change had taken place in the religious condition of the country since Penn's visit of six years before. The Germanic mind was growing more and more into a state of religious ferment, and was breaking away from the old forms, and breaking up into

the innumerable sects whose history in Pennsylvania was so curious.* The people were becoming Seekers, like the English, and Penn and his companions were eager to find those who were in this state of mind.

"We had a good time with him ; for the man is an ancient Seeker, opprest with the cares of this world. . . . We set out towards the city of Duysburg of the Calvinist way, belonging to the Elector of Brandenburg, in and near to which we had been informed there were a retired and seeking people." (Works of Penn, vol. i. p. 78.)

In another passage he speaks of some people who, aroused by the preaching of De Labadie "against the dead and formal churches of the world," had separated themselves and lived "in a way of refined independency." These were, in effect, also Seekers, though not called by that name. Labadie was a Frenchman and a famous preacher. He had been a Jesuit, and after becoming a Protestant was dissatisfied with the Calvinism he found at Geneva. So he went to Holland and became a radical in religion. Penn had seen him on his previous visit ; but by no means approved of him. He calls him airy and unstable and a mere sect-maker. Sect-making for the mere glory of the sect-maker soon became common enough, especially in Germany.

Two of Labadie's followers, Dankers and Sluyter, travelled among the colonies in America in the year 1679, visiting the land that Penn was afterwards to call Pennsylvania, and they kept a most interesting journal which is now largely relied upon by those who wish to know at first hand the manners and condition of the early colonists.

* The Making of Pennsylvania, p. 94.

Before returning to England Penn wrote four tracts,—"A Call to Christendom," "A Tender Hesitation," "To all Professors of Christianity," and "Tender Counsel." They were translated into Dutch and German by Benjamin Furly, an English merchant in Rotterdam, of whom more hereafter, and by him they were published and circulated among the people of those countries who were of a separating and seeking turn of mind.*

On Penn's return to England after this summer missionary tour of three months, he found that, in spite of all the appeals for liberty which had been made by himself and others, the condition of the Quakers was, if anything, worse than ever. The people had become so thoroughly alarmed by the king's leaning towards the Roman Catholics that the magistrates and officials echoed this feeling by enforcing more strictly than ever the laws against dissenters of all kinds. The Puritans avoided the severity of these laws by keeping their religion to themselves, exercising what the Quakers sneeringly called "Christian prudence." But the Quakers, being a very obstinate folk, made few attempts to conceal their meetings or their absence from the regular worship of the Church of England. Evidence was accordingly easily obtained against them, and fines and imprisonments were again sweeping away property and families.

A pretence of giving them a little ease was made by introducing in Parliament a bill which would

* Penna. Mag. Hist., vol. xix. pp. 283, 284.

render the laws applicable only to those who should refuse to take the oath of allegiance and supremacy, which was, in effect, an oath abjuring popery and denying the power of the Pope to absolve British subjects from their allegiance to the crown. By this means, it was said, the laws would act only against the Roman Catholics, and other dissenters would be free. But as the Quakers could not take an oath at all, this bill would put them in a worse plight than ever. They would be classed with the Roman Catholics and Jesuits, and would be in a position to have it said that they refused to acknowledge their allegiance as British subjects.

Penn, as the representative of the Quakers, appealed to Parliament, presented petitions, and made arguments before a committee in favor of a slight amendment by which Quakers should give their word instead of an oath, and be subject to the same penalties for perjury as if they had been under oath.

The old charge that he was a Jesuit in disguise was evidently rife at this time, for a large part of the two speeches he made before the committee is taken up in protesting against this accusation, and in declaring that he and all the Quakers were in the truest sense of the word Protestants, not by any means enemies of the crown and government, but, on the contrary, anxious to support government if they were only allowed to do so in a way approved by their conscience.

He was successful before the House of Commons. They accepted his suggestion and passed the bill with a clause allowing the Quakers to affirm in place

of taking an oath ; but before the bill could be passed by the House of Lords, Parliament was dissolved. It seemed impossible for the Quakers to have any good luck, and in the summer of that year, 1678, that extraordinary creature, Titus Oates, professed to have discovered the popish plot.

The British are a courageous people ; but even in recent times they have been put into what seems to other nations a ridiculous panic by the suggestion of a French invasion, and in earlier periods the suggestion of a Jesuit plot would create among them still greater excitement. Oates, having an insane craving for notoriety, took advantage of both these sources of panic, and told a wonderful tale of what he had learned while he was among the Jesuits. The Pope, he said, had turned over the government of England to the Jesuits, who had already issued commissions appointing Catholics to all the offices of state. The present British statesmen were to be murdered. The king was to be stabbed, or poisoned, or shot with silver bullets. The shipping of the Thames was to be set on fire, and at a given signal the English Catholics were to murder their Protestant neighbors. And, to make sure of the success of all this devilish work, a French army was to land in Ireland.

Oates was a disorderly and disgraced clergyman of the Church of England. He had turned Roman Catholic, or, at least, had made professions of that faith, and had lived at some of the English Jesuit colleges on the continent. He had, of course, heard there all sorts of loose talk about the best means of converting England ; and as force was then a recog-

nized means of conversion, he had, no doubt, actually heard individuals suggest some of the things he reported. These scraps of conversation he wove into a connected tale of an actual organized plot which was to be carried out. He reminded his hearers that London had once been burnt, and insinuated that this work of the Jesuits would be repeated.

Circumstances favored his story. When the papers of Edward Coleman, one of the Catholics he accused, were looked for, it was found that he had just destroyed most of them, and that those which remained spoke of the great expectations in which Romanists might indulge from the present situation in England. Soon after, the magistrate before whom Oates had testified against Coleman was found murdered in a field. When we remember, in addition to this, that the English people, although they did not know of Charles II.'s secret agreement with the King of France, strongly suspected it, that they felt sure of his leaning towards Romanism, and knew that his brother the Duke of York, heir to the throne, had actually turned Romanist and married a Roman Catholic woman; when we remember, also, that they had in their minds the Gunpowder Plot, which was the work of Catholics, the Catholic conspiracies against Queen Elizabeth, and the cruelties of the reign of their Catholic queen, Bloody Mary, it is not hard to understand how they readily believed the tale of Oates and were roused by it to the utmost pitch of fury.

The jails soon contained more papists than Quakers. London was put under the protection of the

militia, cannon were collected, barricades for the streets prepared, every good Protestant citizen carried weapons under his clothes, and guards sat day and night in the vaults under Parliament to save that august body from being blown into the air.

This strange commotion had occurred while the amendment suggested by Penn allowing Quakers to affirm instead of swear was pending in Parliament. But Parliament was now busy excluding Roman Catholic lords from their seats in the upper house, driving the Duke of York from his seat in the Privy Council, and impeaching the lord treasurer for treason. In the hope of stopping this impeachment of his lord treasurer, which might disclose his secret treaty with the King of France, Charles dissolved Parliament in January, 1679, before Penn's amendment could be passed.

The slaughter of the Catholics suspected of the plot now began. Oates was becoming the richest and most powerful man in England. The informers who had been earning small livings by bringing Quakers and Puritans to justice recognized in him a master of their art. They were soon discovering all manner of popish wickedness: armies of invasion preparing abroad and secret assassination plotted at home; and Oates, to remain their leader, was compelled to add new wonders to his original tale.

In this confusion Penn wrote a letter of advice to the Quakers exhorting them to abstain from a worldly spirit. "Fly as for your lives," he says, "from the snares therein, and get you into your watch-tower, the name of the Lord." He wrote a book on the

public situation which passed through two editions, and was called "An Address to Protestants of all Persuasions." The cause of the troublous times was, he says, the attempt to propagate religion by force. The papists had such a terrible history of cruelty in forcing religion that now the country was in a turmoil of fear of them. There never would be peace, however, until the Protestants gave up the cruelty of persecution which they were imitating from Rome.

"Revive," he says, "the noble principle of liberty of conscience on which the Reformation rose; for in vain do we hope to be delivered from papists until we deliver ourselves from popery. This coercion upon conscience and persecution for religion are that part of popery which is most justly hated and feared. And if we either fear or hate popery for its cruelty, shall we practise the cruelty we fear or hate it for?"

He had now an opportunity to argue again on his favorite subject of religious liberty, a subject which he was always eager to press on public attention. He reasoned on this occasion not very brilliantly, it must be confessed; in fact, with much dulness except here and there a striking sentence. In one passage he comes near writing a good aphorism, but spoils it with too many words and interjected ideas. Freed from his verbiage it would be, "Zeal without knowledge is superstition; zeal against knowledge is interest or faction; but zeal with knowledge is religion."

The first part of his book is taken up with a tirade against the wickedness of the times; drunkenness, whoredom, luxury, gambling, cursing, and irrever-

ence, which are also, he thinks, causes of England's troubles. The very plain speaking he indulges himself in here is interesting as a comment on the times. After reading through all he says we are left with an impression that two hundred years have not added much in the way of excessive luxuries. Penn himself lived well even when he was in his wilderness colony of Pennsylvania. He liked handsome furniture, good wines, a well-supplied table, horses, fruit-trees, flower-gardens, and pleasure-boats. The luxury which he condemns must therefore have been a luxury far in excess of his own. He believed in good cooking, but French cookery, he says, was ruining England.

"Natural relish," he says, "is lost in the crowd of the cook's ingredients;" and in furnishing houses "it is a most inexcusable superfluity to bestow an estate to line walls, dress cabinets, embroider beds, with a hundred other unprofitable pieces of state, such as massy plate, rich china, costly pictures, sculpture, fret work, inlayings, and painted windows."

Such complaints, however, have been made in all times. The golden as well as the virtuous age is always in the past or hoped for in the future. The real truth about such matters is that good and bad fashions in morals are perpetually changing. Different periods are virtuous in some things and vicious in others. The peculiar vicious fashion of Penn's time seems to have been wholesale corruption and treachery to one another among the upper classes, and reckless obscene coarseness in speech and manners, indulged in by women as well as by men.

It is, perhaps tedious to mention so many details of Penn's efforts on behalf of liberty; but only by these details can his character be known. He followed up his address to Protestants by a petition to William, Prince of Orange, the famous Hollander, who within a decade was to become King of England and accomplish the reforms in which Penn was wearing out his life. The object of the petition was to ask relief from persecution for some of the people Penn had recently visited at Crevelt on the Rhine; and he renews his old argument of the ridiculous inconsistency of Protestants protesting against papist persecutions, when Protestants were persecuting Protestants.

Penn was by nature a public man. His deep interest in religious liberty and broad questions of public policy, his liberal education, his ability as a writer, his long experience in public speaking and in directing the interests of his sect in stormy political times, besides the associations of his father, the admiral, naturally turned him towards politics. He would surely have taken a very large part in state-craft if Quaker principles had not restrained him. The Quakers abstained almost entirely from political life, and in many instances even from voting, because politics were disturbing to religious contemplation and involved taking and administering oaths and countenancing war. But this was, it seems, only a general rule, which admitted of exceptions when necessary.

The king's dissolution of Parliament compelled a new election, and, with the fears of the popish plot

and the hostility to the king for his popish leaning, the contest was hot and exciting. Questions of religious liberty and questions deeply affecting the Quakers were involved, and Penn threw himself into the contest with enthusiasm. He was a Whig, of course, and he had become a friend of Algernon Sydney, a man of very liberal opinions, who was the Whig candidate for Guildford. Sydney's opinions, indeed, were so extreme that he was considered dangerous to monarchy, and he had been in exile on the continent for many years; but he had been allowed to return for a time to settle his father's estate. Penn made speeches for him, and in the midst of one of these an attempt was made to arrest him as a Jesuit. But his most important effort was a short pamphlet called "England's Great Interest in the Choice of a New Parliament."

From this pamphlet we learn that Penn believed that there was a popish plot as described by Oates; for he says that the first object to be gained by this election is "to pursue the discovery and punishment of the plot." In another passage he advises the voters to choose only sincere Protestants; and they can know false Protestants, he says, "by their laughing at the plot, disgracing the evidence."

That there was an intention at that time and long afterwards on the part of Roman Catholics, both in England and on the continent, to capture the British government and force Catholicism on England admits of no doubt. Protestants were fully justified in guarding against this and in offsetting the Catholic tendency of their king. But Oates's evidence went

ALGERNON SYDNEY

farther than this mere intention, and professed to disclose a regularly organized plot, to be accompanied by wholesale assassination, and this is now believed to have been a mere delusion. But there were thousands like Penn who believed in it.

There is nothing else in his pamphlet which calls for particular comment. He repeats many of his old arguments for a restoration of Anglo-Saxon liberty, and calls for impeachment of the evil counsellors who were misguiding the king. We must be secured, he says, from popery and slavery, and Protestant dissenters must be eased. If this be accomplished the king should be rewarded with increased revenues. It is to be observed that he is hot against popery, and stanch for the defence of English Protestant government.

Algernon Sydney was not elected. He received a majority of the votes, but was not returned because he was not a freeman of Guildford. Penn had not at this time much luck in attaining what he wanted in politics. His political party, the Whigs, secured, however, a large majority in Parliament. This did not suit the king, so he immediately dissolved Parliament again, and there was another election. Algernon Sydney became a candidate for Bamber, in Sussex, was again earnestly supported by Penn, and again defeated.

By his efforts to assist the Whig party against popery Penn was hoping to show that he was not a Jesuit and that the Quakers were not Jesuits. But in the extremely suspicious state of people's minds there were no doubt many who became all the

more suspicious and believed his zeal for the Whigs was only a cunning cover to his secret Jesuitism.

After Sydney's second failure to be elected to Parliament Penn wrote another pamphlet called "One Project for the Good of England," which was intended to assist the Whigs and at the same time put the Quakers in a better position. He argued that Protestants must be united against their old enemy, and that the dissenters and the Church of England must drop their quarrels and present a united front to Rome. In the church of Rome, he said, religion meant not love of God and your neighbor, but civil empire; and to seize the government of England was the prime object of Roman Catholics.

Should not the Church of England then, he asks, stop persecuting us dissenters? Is mere conformity to her worship dearer to her than the general cause of Protestantism and the safety of the British government? Is she not doing what Rome desires her to do,—scattering, impoverishing, and disuniting the dissenters, and weakening the cause of Protestantism? Would a Churchman refuse the help of a Quaker or Baptist to pull him out of a ditch? And why should he deprive himself of that help in the great cause of Protestantism?

He argues again on his old subject of religious liberty as not only right in itself, but as a wise policy which will unite the nation, give it power against Jesuit plots, and also commercial supremacy.

"I ask if more custom comes not to the king, and more trade to the kingdom by encouraging the labor and traffic of an Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Independent, Quaker, and Anabaptist than by an Epis-

copalian only. . . . For till it be the interest of the farmer to destroy his flock, to starve the horse he rides and the cow that gives him milk, it cannot be the interest of England to let a great part of her sober and useful inhabitants be destroyed about things that concern another world."

In conclusion, he says the most important safeguard is to prevent papists passing themselves off as Protestants. The test oath was insufficient because Quakers could not take an oath, and thus were unfairly put in a position of being suspected of popery, and the papists, as the last six months had shown, could get dispensation to take any kind of oath, whether it was against their religion or not. So he offers a new kind of test, which is not a test oath, but a test affirmation which can be taken by Quakers and everybody who is an honest protestant.

He gives a form of this test affirmation, which is certainly a stiff one. The affiant declares, "in good conscience and in the sight of God and man," that Charles II. is the lawful king, that the Pope has no authority to depose him or absolve his subjects from their allegiance, or give them the right to conspire against him or assassinate him ; and then the affiant goes on denying all the important doctrines of Romanism, and closes by declaring that he does this without any equivocation or mental reservation, and that the words he uses are to be taken in their plain and usual sense.

This test, Penn proposed, should be administered through magistrates and parish officers to every one in England ; and every one should be compelled to take it annually on Ash Wednesday, the day "when

the Pope curses all Protestants." It would, he argued, unite the whole Protestant interest.

It would certainly, if it had been adopted, have put the Quakers in a much-improved position, and relieved them from the violent accusations of the rabble. Penn's serious proposal of it no doubt helped to relieve to some extent both him and his sect from the suspicion of Jesuitism.

XIV

THE HOLY EXPERIMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ALMOST immediately after Penn's first experience in practical politics in his attempt to secure the election to Parliament of Algernon Sydney, he came into still closer contact with political life and government. His efforts for Sydney and his pamphlet against popery were in the year 1679, and in 1680 we find him moving to obtain from the crown a grant of the land in America which he was to call Pennsylvania.

At first sight this might seem to be a rather sudden move on his part; but there is reason to believe that the project had been more or less in his mind for twenty years. His biographers have usually assigned to him the credit of originating this idea of establishing a Quaker colony. But the idea was not at all original with him; and if it originated with any one person, it was with George Fox. Even the tract of land selected for the colony was not of Penn's choosing, for both Fox and the Quakers had had their attention directed towards it for a long time.

Almost as soon as they were conscious of being a sect the Quakers had thought of establishing a refuge for themselves in the American wilderness. Suffering so severely from the laws made against them, it was natural that they should have this

thought. The Puritans had gone out to Massachusetts, where they were having their own way in religious matters, and the Roman Catholics, under the leadership of Lord Baltimore, had gone to Maryland.

But where should the Quakers go? They must have a territory and colony of their own, for those of them who had gone to Massachusetts were being whipped at the cart's tail, and four of them were hung. They were worse off in Massachusetts than in England. They could not get land anywhere in New England. They did not care to go among the Churchmen in Virginia, nor among the Roman Catholics in Maryland; and the Dutch held New York.

As early almost as the year 1650, certainly as early as 1656 or 1657, George Fox had fixed his thoughts on that great region which lay unoccupied just north of Maryland and behind New Jersey. It had not been taken by anybody in particular, because it was some distance back from the sea-shore. But a great river, which the Dutch had called the Zuydt, the Swedes New Swedeland Stream, and the English the Delaware, led up to it, and it was said to be easy enough of access.

There was a Quaker in those days named Josiah Cole, who had already travelled in America and had been among the Indian tribes. Fox consulted with him, and when Cole made a second journey to America, in 1660, he was commissioned to treat with the Susquehanna Indians, who were supposed to be the red lords of that great space north of Maryland. Cole went among these Indians, and told them his errand. But they were at war with other tribes, and

William Fuller, a Maryland Quaker of much influence, who must be relied upon to make the purchase, was absent. Nothing could be done at that time, and in November, 1660, Cole reported this result to Fox in a letter, which may still be read in Bowden's "History of the Friends in America." *

Although nothing could be done, the subject was no doubt debated among the followers of Fox in England, and in the year after Cole's letter was written the discussion must have reached the ears of Penn, who was then a student at Christ Church College; for twenty years afterwards he writes, "I had an opening of joy as to these parts in the year 1661 at Oxford."

It was about this same time that Penn received his first impulse towards the Quaker faith, from the preaching of Thomas Loe, and at the meetings where he heard Loe he must have heard also of the plan for a Quaker colony in America, so the two great things of his life, his religion and his colony, were suggested to his mind at almost the same time, or at least within a year of each other, while he was a youth at college.

The thought of starting life and religion afresh in the virgin forests of America would appeal strongly to Penn and carry him away into boundless enthusiasm. It must have touched him deeply when it first entered his young mind. He says it was an "opening of joy," and we can easily fancy how a

* Vol. i. p. 389. See also Pennsylvania: Colony and Commonwealth, p. 2.

college boy's imagination would run riot with such a suggestion. Even if he had not been religious, the thought of subduing nature and the adventures of the wilderness would arouse the strongest energies of a soul that was naturally vigorous and manly. But when, in addition, his rather over-serious moral nature saw the vision of leading out a persecuted people to liberty and happiness, delivering them from imprisonment, tithes, and corruption, and establishing for them, far from contamination, the primitive religion of Christ, we can understand why he describes it as "an opening of joy."

In the year 1680, when he began to negotiate with the crown for the great tract of land he had dreamed of when a boy and which the Quakers had so long hoped to secure, he had already had some experience in colonial business. New Jersey had been divided into two colonies,—East Jersey, belonging to Sir George Carteret, and West Jersey, belonging to Lord Berkeley. West Jersey was sold, in 1675, by Lord Berkeley to John Fenwick, in trust for Edward Byllinge. Both Fenwick and Byllinge were Quakers, and getting into a dispute about the property, called upon Penn to act as arbitrator. The Quakers were very much opposed to law-suits among their own people, and wherever it was possible peace-makers, as they were called, settled all disputes.

Fenwick was dissatisfied with Penn's decision, and Penn seems to have been very uneasy lest there might still be a law-suit, which would bring discredit on their faith. The efforts he used to bring about

a settlement seem to show that the avoidance of lawsuits was at that time of prime importance. He pleaded hard with Fenwick to "prevent the mischief that will certainly follow divulging it in Westminster Hall," and at last he was successful.

Byllinge, however, soon went bankrupt, and transferred his interest in West Jersey to Penn and some others to hold as trustees for the benefit of his creditors. Penn was active in managing the property, secured a definite boundary line between it and East Jersey, and appears to have assisted in drawing up, in 1676, a constitution for its government.

In this constitution religious liberty is established, as we should naturally expect in any constitution Penn or the Quakers were concerned with, and fair trial by jury is also secured, for Penn had suffered much from the violation of fair trial in England. Many Quakers went out to West Jersey, and their descendants still form a respectable element in the population. So Penn was instrumental in establishing somewhat of a refuge for his people in West Jersey five or six years before he received the grant of Pennsylvania.

Sir George Carteret, who owned East Jersey, died in 1679, and by his will left directions that his province should be sold; and Penn and eleven others became the purchasers. They soon admitted twelve more to share the property with them, so that there were twenty-four proprietors. They appointed as governor Robert Barclay, who had become a Quaker about the same time as Penn, and he was now a

theologian and the author of the book known as "Barclay's Apology," which has usually been regarded as the ablest of all statements of Quaker doctrine. But he never went to the province. He remained in England and sent out deputies to govern in his name. Under this Quaker governor and the Quaker proprietors a few of the sect were added to the population.

But neither East nor West Jersey became Quaker strongholds. It seemed to be impossible to make them such. They never realized the original expectations of Fox and others when they had looked upon the land north of Maryland as the future home of their faith in America. There were few elements of prosperity in the Jerseys. The soil was not so fertile and the general characteristics not so attractive as the vast forests and mountain ranges of Pennsylvania. Penn's interest in New Jersey was slight, and soon disappeared altogether from his life; for in 1702 the proprietors of both the Jerseys surrendered their rights to Queen Ann, and henceforth the two provinces were one under the direct rule of the crown.

The original plan which Fox had entertained of securing the land north of Maryland having remained in abeyance for twenty years, there must have been some special reason why Penn determined to act upon it and carry it out in the year 1680. But of this reason we are not informed, and can only conjecture.

Possibly in the four or five years since 1676, during which he had been concerned with the man-

agement of the Jerseys, he not only learned of the vast superiority of the land which lay the other side of the Delaware, but he saw that the Jerseys could never be made into a real Quaker colony, the sort of colony which Fox and the early Quakers had originally designed. No doubt he also saw that if this original design was ever to be carried into effect some one man must take hold of it and push it through with enthusiasm. He was rich, burdened with no cares except those he chose to create, and he had inherited a valuable friendship and influence with the king and with the Duke of York, who was heir to the throne.

Why wait longer? After thirty years of struggle, ardent advocacy of liberty of conscience, and heroic endurance of imprisonment, the Quakers, though greatly increased in numbers, were as much persecuted as ever. They had failed to convince the governing powers that they ought to be let alone; they had failed to establish as the universal practice of England the old Anglo-Saxon freedom. Why should not some of them go where they could create such freedom as they chose?

There was also a little circumstance which might be a great help. Admiral Penn had never received all his salary as a naval officer from the crown, and he had lent the crown money for naval purposes. This debt now amounted to £16,000, not a large sum in our times for a government to pay; but Charles II. was always in want of money. He had an expensive court, and expensive favorites and mistresses to keep amused, and was, indeed, so

straightened that he had sacrificed his own honor and the honor of his country for the sake of receiving secret assistance from the King of France. He would never pay Penn £16,000 in money. He would keep putting it off, no matter how urgently pressed. But he might be willing to pay it in wild uninhabited land. A suggestion to that effect would strike him at once as a good bargain. He would get rid of a troublesome debt without paying a penny, he would strengthen the colonial possessions of the empire, and get rid of many thousands of Quakers who were always complaining and making an expensive trouble at home.

It would be interesting if we knew exactly when and how it occurred to Penn to make this use of the debt he had inherited from his father. But we have no details at this time. We only know that in 1680 he sent a petition to the king asking that in payment of the debt of £16,000 he be given a tract of land in America lying north of Maryland, "bounded on the east by the Delaware River, on the west limited as Maryland, and northward to extend as far as plantable."

Penn must have previously discussed this grant with the leading Quakers, and discussed also his future plans for settling and governing his province. It is impossible to think of his not doing so; and he must also have sounded some of the people at court and gauged the probability of success for his petition. We know from his subsequent letters that he secured the assistance and influence of Lord North and Lord Sunderland.

When the petition came before a committee of the king's privy council there was considerable discussion about the boundaries, whether they would not conflict with the lines of some of the New England colonies whose charters extended them westward to the Pacific Ocean, and there was also some difficulty about the boundaries on Maryland. The committee settled all these questions to their own satisfaction; but the settlement was by no means permanent. No colony was ever given boundaries which occasioned so much dispute. Terrible controversies and disastrous petty warfare followed because Pennsylvania was believed to cut off the western extension of Connecticut. The boundary on Maryland was litigated for over seventy years. But it is needless to discuss these questions here, as I have treated them very fully in another book.*

Suffice it to say now that through an unfortunate mistake the apparent boundaries of Maryland had thirty years before been made to include a large part of what is now Pennsylvania; and through an equally unfortunate mistake the apparent boundaries of Pennsylvania were made to include nearly the whole of Maryland. If the Maryland boundaries were right, Philadelphia was a Maryland town, and if the Pennsylvania boundaries were right, Baltimore was a Pennsylvania town.

But independently of all these questions, the tract of land which Penn and his heirs finally received, and which it was the intention of the king that they

* The Making of Pennsylvania, chaps. x. and xi.

should receive, was an enormous one, containing over forty thousand square miles of territory, the largest tract that had ever been given in America to a single individual, and, as we now know, the richest in natural resources of coal, iron, petroleum, and a fertile soil.

It was the only royal grant in America that was bought with money. In all other instances when a province was given to a single individual, as to Lord Baltimore, or to a corporation, as in the case of Massachusetts, no price was paid. The agreement of the people to risk their lives and fortune in settling the province was supposed to be a sufficient consideration for the grant. But Penn paid what was in effect a very large sum by agreeing to accept his grant in extinguishment of the debt due him from the crown. This partially explains the vast size of his province. As he was offering a larger consideration than any one before him had offered, he was certainly entitled to receive more land than any of his predecessors had received. Then, too, we must remember that both the king and the Duke of York felt particularly bound to Penn for his father's sake, and had promised the father that they would aid and protect the son. There was surely no other Quaker whose circumstances and hereditary influence would have enabled him to obtain for his people such a huge and valuable territory.

On the 4th of March, 1681, the charter received the king's signature, and Penn was lord of a domain considerably larger than Ireland, and lacking only about six thousand square miles of being as large as England.

"This day my country was confirmed to me under the great seal of England, with large powers and privileges, by the name of Pennsylvania; a name the king would give it in honor of my father. I chose New Wales, being as this a pretty hilly country, but Penn being Welsh for a head, as Pennanmoire in Wales, and Penrith in Cumberland, and Penn in Buckinghamshire, the highest land in England, called this Pennsylvania, which is the high or head woodlands; for I proposed when the secretary, a Welshman, refused to have it called New Wales, Sylvania, and they added Penn to it; and though I much opposed it and went to the king to have it struck out and altered, he said it was past and would take it upon him; nor could twenty guineas move the under secretary to vary the name; for I feared lest it should be looked on as a vanity in me, and not as a respect in the king, as it truly was, to my father, whom he often mentions with praise." (Hazard's Annals, 500.)

The charter was modelled largely on the one granted to Lord Baltimore for Maryland fifty years before, and was thoroughly feudal in its nature. Penn was in somewhat the same position as the lord of an old English manor. The land was all his, and the colonists were to be his tenants, paying him rent. In exchange for this great privilege he was to pay to the king two beaver-skins annually, to be delivered at the king's castle at Windsor, and the king was also to receive a fifth of all the gold and silver that should be found in the province.

Penn was, however, compelled by the charter, as Lord Baltimore had been compelled by his charter, to give his colonists free government. The laws were to be made by him with the assent of the people or their delegates, which, translated into actual practice, gave the people the right to elect a legislative body, and gave Penn a veto on such acts as this legislative body should pass. He had also the power to appoint magistrates, judges, and other officers, and to

grant pardons for crimes. By the charter he was the perpetual governor of the colony; but he usually remained in England, and appointed a deputy governor to exercise his authority. In brief, the people controlled the legislative part of the government, while Penn, through his power to appoint all officials, controlled the executive.

About a month after he received his charter, he commissioned his cousin, William Markham, a son of Admiral Penn's sister, to go out to Pennsylvania, take possession of it in his name, and, until a regular government could be established, rule over the scattered families of Swedes, English, and Dutch who were living along the banks of the Delaware. Markham reached the Delaware about the first of July, 1681, and made his head-quarters at a place called Upland, about fifteen miles below the present site of Philadelphia. He remained there in charge of affairs more than a year, for Penn did not arrive in his province until October, 1682.

In the mean time Penn secured an addition to his territory. Learning from Markham that Lord Baltimore disputed his boundaries, he obtained, by a grant from the Duke of York, the land now included in the State of Delaware. Penn's object in getting this additional land was to secure control of the whole western shore of the Delaware River and Bay from his province down to the ocean, and at the same time to strengthen himself against Lord Baltimore, whose claims, according to Markham's account, cut far into the southern half of Pennsylvania.

Penn also, before he started for his province, ad-

vertised for settlers, and explained fully the conditions and prospects. At the same time he warned the public, in his careful, conscientious way, that they must not rush inconsiderately into this new enterprise. They would have to endure a winter in Pennsylvania before they could enjoy a summer, and be willing to go two or three years without the comforts and conveniences of England. But, on the other hand, the planting of colonies, he said, was great and glorious work, and he went on to show how it would strengthen England, instead of weakening her, as some supposed.

Those who wished to come to him could have land by paying £100 for five thousand acres, and annually thereafter a shilling rent for every hundred acres. Those who had not ready money to pay in this way could have two hundred acres or less at the rent of a shilling per acre. They should have their own legislature; no laws should be passed or money raised without the people's consent; and they should have all the British rights and liberties.

Penn was, indeed, very busy with preparations during the year Markham waited for him. He would have started immediately, but could not. He wished to take out with him a large number of settlers. Many had agreed to go, but they wanted time to settle their home affairs. He was expecting people from France, Holland, and Scotland, as well as from England. In a letter written at this time he speaks of his enterprise as "an holy experiment," a phrase which has now for a long time been applied to it by the Quakers.

He must have enjoyed the preparations, and looked forward with delight and impatience to the day when he could plunge with his people into the wilderness. And here it should be said that he intended that his province should be profitable. He intended to increase his own and his family's fortune, to widen his influence through wealth and become a man of power in the world, the feudal ruler of a great and prosperous province, which was large enough to be an empire.

This was not inconsistent with calling his enterprise "an holy experiment," nor with his intention to establish a refuge for the people of his faith. He intended to accomplish both; to accomplish, indeed, everything; to prove that complete religious liberty was not only right and Christian, but profitable and advantageous in every way. He would show how people would flourish under it in agriculture, commerce, and all the arts and refinements of life. He would show that government could be carried on without war and without oaths, that the pure, original, primitive Christianity of the times of the apostles could be maintained without an established church, without a hireling ministry, without cruelty or persecution, without ridiculous dogmas or unmanly ritual, simply by its own innate power, the spirit of Christ, the inward light. He would do this through the aid of his followers, the Quakers, who would never desert him, through his own sincerity of purpose and energy of mind, through his feudal ownership of a vast domain, and through the power which wealth would give.

It was a stupendous plan, an heroic grasp for a whole world of light and truth by one who had been living for centuries in darkness; for Penn was typical of his time; he was the voice of his time crying passionately, recklessly, for light after the long night of the Middle Ages.

Men came to him at this time, and said that they would organize a company and give him £6000, if he would give to them the monopoly of all the trade with the Indians in his province, but he refused it.

"As the Lord gave it [his province] me over all and great opposition, . . . I would not abuse his love, nor act unworthy of his providence, and so defile what came to me clean. No; let the Lord guide me by his wisdom, and preserve me to honor His name and serve His truth and people, that an example and standard may be set up to the nations; there may be room there, though none here."

He had peculiar opinions about the Indians, opinions which were very peculiar in his time, but shared with him by the Quakers. He accepted the law of that age, that Christians could take the land of heathen savages; but he added to it that the Christians must pay for every rod of the land, and in their trade and dealings with the Indians treat them with perfect fairness and honor. This idea of scrupulously paying the Indians for their land was not original with him, but suggested, as he tells us, by the Bishop of London.* It was easy enough to write or repeat a philanthropic proposition like this. Many have done so. But Penn lived up to it.

He prepared a paper called "conditions or con-

* Buck's Penn in America, p. 127.

cessions," by which his province should be governed until a regular government could be established. These conditions provided for the survey of a city, laying out of roads, and the last part attempted to regulate intercourse with the Indians in such a way that they should not be defrauded. Trade with them was to be openly and honestly conducted. A colonist who wronged an Indian was to be punished as if he had wronged a white man. Disputes between colonists and Indians were to be settled by a jury of twelve, six of whom should be Indians.

He objected to giving any one a monopoly of trade with the Indians, not only because the Indians might be defrauded, but because the monopoly would be unfair. For the same reason he refused large prices for particular points of advantage in the province, because he wished to treat all alike. Some of the people of his own faith tried to drive special bargains with him for land; but he refused, and declared that all must buy at the same rates. One who had been thus disappointed reports in a letter, "I believe he truly does aim more at justice and righteousness, and spreading of truth than at his own particular gain."

He succeeded in getting some ships started with emigrants, although he was unable to accompany them; and in the autumn after Markham started he sent out three commissioners to fix upon a site for a town, and treat with the Indians. From his instructions to these commissioners we learn how he was planning his great experiment, and what a pleasure

it must have been to imagine to himself an ideal Quaker town, and send men to lay it out in the fresh wilderness.

He tells them to sound all the creeks on the Pennsylvania side of the Delaware "in order to settle a great town, and be sure to make your choice where it is most navigable, high, dry, and healthy; that is, where most ships may best ride, of deepest draught of water, if possible to load or unload at the bank or key side, without boating or lighterage." It would be well, he tells them, if the creek coming into the river where they build the town be navigable for boats up into the country.

This was his first conception of Philadelphia; and his commissioners had no trouble in locating it; for we learn from other sources that the scattered families that lived along the river had long known where was the best site for a great town. The advantages Penn mentions were, on the whole, best combined at a spot a few miles north of the mouth of the Schuylkill, which was the sort of creek he wanted, navigable for boats up into the country.

He has told us in a passage already quoted why the province was given its name, but we have no explanation of why Philadelphia was so called. The word means brotherly love, but I do not think that was the reason. It was the name of an ancient city in Asia Minor where one of the seven churches of the primitive Christians was established; and as the Quakers were attempting to return to primitive Christianity, this would be a strong reason for giving the name.

He goes on to tell the commissioners how to lay out the land, to "be impartially just and courteous" to any old settlers they found on it, to "be tender of offending the Indians, and hearken by honest spies, if you can hear that anybody inveigles them not to sell, or to stand off and raise the value upon you." He arranges the figure of the town with uniform streets, places the store-houses and markets where he thinks they should be, and directs that they should select a place in the middle of the line of houses facing the river "for the situation of my house." He must have been as happy as a boy building a toy city, in the middle of which he was to live like a patriarch surrounded by his people.

"Let every house be placed, if the person pleases, in the middle of its plat, as to the breadth way of it, that so there may be ground on each side for gardens or orchards, or fields, that it may be a green country town, which will never be burnt and always wholesome."

Then the commissioners were to see that "no vice or evil conversation go uncomplained of or unpunished in any; that God be not provoked to wrath against the country." He sent an excellent letter to the Indians, whom he told of the Great Spirit who had made both the white man and the red.

"Now the great God hath been pleased to make me concerned in your part of the world; and the king of the country where I live hath given me a great province therein; but I desire to enjoy it with your love and consent, that we may always live together as neighbors and friends; else what would the great God do to us who hath made us (not to devour and destroy one another, but) to live soberly and kindly together in the world?"

While he was making all these preparations he did not forget George Fox, and set aside for him a gift of twelve hundred and fifty acres of land. He had also other things to think of besides Pennsylvania. His writings were during this year all published together in folio, several of his essays, notably "No Cross, No Crown," having reached a second edition. He was obliged, at the same time, to resist a defection caused by John Wilkinson and John Story, who objected to the increasing strictness of discipline. They protested against the increasing control over the conduct and conversation of individuals who, they said, should be left more to themselves, each one being guided by the divine light within him. The Quaker discipline had, indeed, become very strict. There was a complete system of watching and reporting on the conduct of members, and those of unsuitable behavior were disowned. Wilkinson and Story seem to have maintained that there should be no disowning. The church should merely advise or remonstrate. To attempt more than this was to drift into ecclesiasticism.

It was, indeed, a delicate question to decide how far the liberty which the Quakers had been so earnest in advocating should be limited and controlled. Penn wrote on the question a pamphlet called "The State of Liberty Spiritual." Like Fox, he was always in favor of the discipline, without which, he said, there would be nothing but confusion.

It would never do, he said, to accept Wilkinson's and Story's plea, "What hast thou to do with me? Leave me to my freedom and to the grace of God

in myself." One might say I see no evil in "paying tithes to a hireling priest;" another, I see no evil in "hiding in times of persecution," or in "marrying by the priest," or in "keeping my shop shut upon the world's holidays and mass days," or in "declining public testimony in suffering times;" and so the society would be broken up and scattered.

"The power that Christ gave to his church was this, that offenders after the first and second admonition (not repenting) should be rejected: not imprisoned, plundered, banished, or put to death."

At that very time there was plenty of temptation to hide from persecution; for the magistrates, especially in Bristol, were bestirring themselves, meetings were broken up, heavy fines inflicted, and men, women, and even children, led away to prison. There was more need than ever for a refuge in Pennsylvania. But Penn must pause in the delightful work of planning the details of that ideal province and follow his more usual avocation of comforting and assisting those who were suffering under the law. He had become such an important man that he had been for many years free from arrest and annoyance. But now, although he was enough in favor with the king to receive the gift of an empire of land, he was ordered by a constable to stop preaching when he rose in the meeting on Gracechurch Street. He paid no attention to the order; and it is said that the constable, although supported by soldiers, was so affected by the solemnity of the meeting and by what he heard that he made no attempt to interfere.

XV

GREAT CARE WITH THE CONSTITUTION AND LAWS

BEFORE Penn sailed for Pennsylvania he had still another task to perform. He must prepare a form of government to be adopted by himself and the people of his province, and this he did in the spring of 1682.

He consulted about it with his friend Algernon Sydney, and there has been some discussion as to the share Sydney had in framing it. Penn's biographer, Dixon, gives him a large share, saying that it was at his instance that Penn adopted an essentially democratic basis, and that so continuous was Sydney's aid that it is impossible to separate his work from Penn's. But there is no evidence that justifies such an assertion. The charter which Penn had received from the crown compelled him to adopt a democratic basis, for it required that he should share with the people the power of making laws.

All we know positively of the aid given by Sydney is contained in a letter to him by Penn upbraiding him for abusing the Constitution. Sydney had been reported, Penn says, of "saying I had a good country, but the worst laws in the world, not to be endured or lived under, and that the Turk was not more absolute than I." This had almost broken

Penn's regard for him, and the letter was written to restore friendship and remind Sydney that at least one of his suggestions had been accepted.

This suggestion had been to the effect that the Constitution as prepared was too positive, and appeared as an act of Penn's which his people were bound to accept rather than a proposal which he was offering for their acceptance. Penn did not think that his constitution was worded in this positive way ; but as he fully intended that it should be only a proposal for his people's acceptance, he altered it in accordance with Sydney's objection, so that there should be no doubt on that point.

It appears, also, from this letter that Sydney had prepared a draft of a constitution, submitted it to Penn, and then taken it back to finish and polish; but whether Penn ever made any use of it does not appear.

It would seem as if too much had been made of Penn's relations with Sydney. They have been spoken of in Penn's biographies as devoted friends, and in Pennsylvania their association with each other has been idealized, and Sydney has been regarded as the champion of liberty and as a much greater man than he really was. It became the fashion at one time to name children after him, and there are still Algernon Sydneys to be found among some of the prominent families in Philadelphia.

Penn supported him for Parliament and consulted him slightly about the constitution, but beyond that he does not seem to have been intimate with him, and there is no evidence at all of an ideal

friendship. Sydney was what in those days was called a republican; that is to say, he wished to abolish the British monarchy and establish in its place some sort of republic or commonwealth. He was a courageous, but a very violent and reckless man. He had no constructive or statesman-like qualities; but he had the merit of not being much of a trimmer, and he would not fawn and flatter when the tide turned against him, as most people did at that time.

He was executed for taking part in the Rye House Plot shortly after Penn went out to Pennsylvania, and it was his death that made him famous. There was only one witness against him, and the law required two. But Judge Jeffreys was equal to the occasion. He said that one witness and a circumstance were equivalent to two witnesses; and the circumstance against Sydney was that he had written an unpublished manuscript against monarchy. The outcry that was raised against this shocking injustice, and the manner in which Sydney bore his fate kept echoing among the lovers of liberty for more than a hundred years, and fully account for what now seems to have been an over-estimate of his importance.

Penn, it may be said in passing, was not a republican. So far as we can judge, he seems to have been usually in favor of a limited constitutional monarchy as the best government for England; but in his relations with James II. he seemed very much inclined to dispense with the limitations and all constitutional restraint.

In preparing his constitution for Pennsylvania he consulted with many besides Sydney. We know now what was not known to his previous biographers, that he consulted with Benjamin Furly, who was an Englishman from Colchester, who had gone to live in Holland. He became a prosperous merchant at Rotterdam, was a patron of letters, a collector of rare books, a writer of some little celebrity, and very much interested in all separatist sects, especially the Quakers, whose faith he seems to have for a time adopted. His house was the resort of learned and distinguished men, and, among others, of Algernon Sydney, and also Locke, the philosopher, who had been at college with Penn at Christ Church. Furly had welcomed and travelled with Penn and his companions when they made their missionary journey to Holland and Germany. He interested himself to procure German emigrants for Pennsylvania, and was, in effect, Penn's agent on the continent.*

Penn sent him the final draft of the constitution, and must also have submitted to him a previous draft, for Furly compares the final draft with a previous draft, which he appears to have had in his possession. He wrote a long criticism on the final draft, making some forty or fifty suggestions, which we need not here describe in detail, because Penn rejected them all. In one point at least, however, Furly proved to be right. Penn had given to the upper house of the legislature, or provincial council,

* Penna. Mag. of Hist., vol. xix. p. 277.

as he called it, the sole power of originating laws. Furly said that the lower house should also have this right; and when the constitution had been in force for some years, this change was made after repeated demands for it by the people.

Judging from all this, from the internal evidence of the Constitution itself, and from some other evidence which we are about to mention, we can say that Penn consulted very widely and earnestly, and took the greatest pains in preparing his constitution, or frame, as he called it. He was evidently determined to have for his holy experiment the best government possible, and to obtain the assistance of the most advanced and enlightened thought on the subject. Exactly what suggestions he obtained from different people cannot now be determined. Apparently he did not take many, preferring to work out the problem in his own way, using the suggestions he received merely as hints to perfect his own plans, without radically altering them.

Among the Penn papers in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania are a collection of about twenty different drafts of the constitution which he prepared or had prepared before he got one which entirely satisfied him. These drafts have been arranged in an order which shows the gradual development of his ideas, and also, we may perhaps say, of the ideas of those who assisted him, from the first crude suggestions down to the finished document which was finally adopted.

None of them are entirely in his handwriting. They are usually very neatly written, some appar-

ently by clerks and others, possibly by persons who were offering them as suggestions; and some of them are arranged in diagram form, evidently for the sake of greater clearness in studying and reflecting on the subject. Many of them are interlined and marked in various ways in Penn's handwriting.

The first one is exceedingly crude, and creates a government by a landed aristocracy. The legislature is to be called the senate, and consists of two houses. The lower house is to be elected by the renters; but the upper house is to be hereditary, and composed of the "first fifty proprietors or lords" and their heirs. The baronage of any one of them is to cease when his land is reduced below two thousand acres, and the rest are to choose another in his place. This House of Lords is to be always in being, to sit and adjourn at its pleasure, and "to appoint all officers by ballot, in church and state." This would mean that the Quaker faith or some religion would be established by law, so we can hardly believe that Penn was the author of this draft. It must have been the suggestion of one of his friends.

The next draft in order is in the same handwriting as the first, and is marked on the back "Darnal's Draught;" so, presumably, the first one was also by him. But this second one is much more advanced. The hereditary quality in the upper house has disappeared, and this house is to be elected four out of every county by the proprietors of the county. The governor is to have a treble vote in this body, and various detailed provisions follow. The two

houses are to be called the Parliament, and the governor is to have a council of twenty-four, which he is to select out of forty-eight nominated by the two houses. A system of law courts is also provided for, and there are other details showing that more thought had been given to the subject.

The next draft is in an entirely different handwriting, apparently the formal handwriting of a clerk. It reads as if some one had taken the provisions of the previous draft and written them in other language, making changes and additions. Many of the additions would belong in laws rather than in a constitution, and, in fact, several of them, such as making all prisons work-houses, registering deeds, and so on, were afterwards put in the laws. There are many interlineations on this draft, apparently in the handwriting of Penn. At the end of it there is a provision, afterwards adopted, that the constitution should not be altered except by the consent of the governor and six parts in seven of the Parliament.

Then comes a draft in a new hand, evidently the writing of a well-accomplished man, not a clerk, which suggests that during the infancy or the first seven years of the colony there should be a government by a landed aristocracy, which after the seven years had expired might become more liberal.

Of the sixteen other drafts which follow we need not give the details, because they are for the most part variations and enlargements of those already given. The idea that the upper house, though elected by the people, must be composed of large landholders, clings to nearly all of them. Penn con-

tinues to annotate and interline. Some of the drafts are written in formal clerkly hands, and others in hands like what we might suppose would be the scholarly handwriting of some of Penn's friends. They become longer and more complicated as they progress, until at last we come to several which are almost the same as the one finally adopted.

The one adopted had prefixed to it a preamble on the divine origin of government and on government in general, rather wordy and diffuse, except for one or two apt sentences, which we have already quoted in the first chapter. When he came to the actual details of his government we find him clinging quite closely to the forms that were already in practical working in the other colonies in America. He has a governor, a governor's council, and an assembly of the people, just as in the constitutions developed in New England. The people are to elect the council, as in the New England charters, and it is called the provincial council.

The variations on the New England type were first of all that the council was to be very large and contain seventy-two members. In the other colonies the council was seldom composed of more than ten or twenty. This enlargement of the council had appeared all through the drafts, where it was sometimes enlarged into an upper house of landed proprietors, or even into an hereditary house of lords. Even as finally arranged, it was more of an upper house of legislature than a governor's council, and it was given the sole right of originating legislation. The assembly of the people could merely accept or

reject its proposals. In this notion of developing the governor's council into an upper house of such importance that the lower house would be completely dwarfed and insignificant, Penn may have been influenced by the constitution which his collegemate Locke prepared for the government of the Carolinas.

It was not a successful device, this excessive enlargement of the council or upper house. It worked badly in practice, and was so completely abolished that during most of the colonial period Pennsylvania's form of government provided for no governor's council at all, and no upper house of the legislature.

It cannot be said that this constitution of Penn's, after all the pains he had taken with it, was an unusually good one. Most of its essential qualities were not different from those of other colonial governments in America, and where they were different, as in the case of the governor's council or upper house, it was not for the better. His governor's council, which had the extraordinary privilege of originating legislation, and was the most important legislative body, had also attached to it the executive functions of guarding the peace and safety, laying out towns, modelling public buildings, inspecting the treasury, and establishing schools. Such a confusion of legislative and executive powers was even in that time a monstrosity in politics.

His constitution had in it, however, some interesting provisions. It was the first constitution which provided a method for its own alteration and amend-

ment. This was quite an advanced thought. Locke had provided that his Carolina constitution should never be altered, and other constitutions and charters were silent on the subject. But all American frames of government are now like Penn's, and contain a provision for their orderly amendment without violence or revolution.

His method of impeachment, by which the lower house was to bring the impeachment, and the upper house to try it, was also new in American governments, and is now universal among them. He was also the first person to lay down the principle that any law which violated the constitution should be void. Constitution-makers had been much troubled to provide a method to protect their constitutions from violation, and had suggested various complicated devices. But Penn was the first one to hit upon the foundation or first step in the true principle, now the universal law in the United States, that the unconstitutional law is void. If he had taken the next step, and provided that the courts had power to declare such a law void whenever it came before them in a case, he would have been the inventor of the complete system as we now have it. But this step of declaring such power in the courts was not made until one hundred years after his time.*

Taken altogether, this constitution was very characteristic of Penn. It was an earnest, zealous attempt to attain the best sort of government; but, as often

* For a full discussion of these provisions in Penn's constitution, see "The Evolution of the Constitution," pp. 60, 184.

happened with him, some of its idealism was not successful; and yet in the end, when all was said and done, his untiring energy had furnished some ideas and principles of permanent value.

The final draft of the constitution was dated April 25, 1682, and was agreed to by Penn and some of those who were to go out to the province. They also, a few weeks later, agreed upon certain laws which, with the constitution, they intended to take out to Pennsylvania and propose to the people there for their acceptance. These laws contained many of the advanced ideas which had for many years been animating the Quakers.

All prisons were to be work-houses and places for reformation and cleanliness, instead of the pestilential dungeons of idleness, dirt, and increasing vice in which the Quakers had suffered so much wretchedness and death in England. An attempt was made to abolish lawyers and lessen litigation by providing that every one might plead his own cause, and, as the ancient adage has it, have a fool for a client. Trial by jury was carefully established, but no oaths were required. All children were to be taught some useful trade, a practice which the Quakers had long advocated, but had not been able to enforce among all their members, and they were equally unsuccessful in enforcing it by law in Pennsylvania.

Religious liberty was, of course, established in these laws; but only in the sense in which it was then sometimes understood, and was confined to those who believed in God. Atheists were not within the sphere of its protection. Similarly, no

one could hold office in the government unless he professed faith in Jesus Christ. This was not the first establishment of liberty of conscience in the colonies. It had been established by the charter of Rhode Island in 1663, in East Jersey in 1655, by Locke's Carolina constitution of 1669, and in West Jersey in 1677, and rather more liberally and broadly than Penn established it, for it was not confined to those who believed in God.

The Quakers were very much opposed to capital punishment, especially the wholesale capital punishment for minor offences prevailing at that time in England. Accordingly, we find in Penn's code only treason and murder deemed worthy of death; and the property of murderers, instead of being forfeited to the state, was divided among the next of kin of the sufferer and of the criminal.

Penn's biographers have usually given him the credit of all these very advanced ideas; but it is hardly just, for they were the ideas of the Quakers, and he was merely trying to put them in practice.

There were also laws which reflected the puritan feeling among the Quakers. Cursing, swearing, drunkenness, health-drinking, cards, dice, gambling, stage-plays, scolding, and lying in conversation, were strictly prohibited.

XVI

FIRST VISIT TO THE PROVINCE

At last, in the summer of 1682, a little more than a year after he had received his charter, he was ready to start for Pennsylvania. For his wife and children he left a letter of farewell, which is the most beautiful, perhaps the only really beautiful, thing he ever wrote. The diffuseness and dulness of his usual style disappear entirely in this letter. He does not labor to prove dry propositions, but speaks with a reality and directness which seem to show that his nature was strongest and at its best when aroused by tenderness and affection. From several passages in the letter one may infer that he had learned from experience that this tender side was also his weak side, and that he saw the danger of wasting one's energy in friendships.

"Guard against encroaching friendships. Keep them at arm's end: for it is giving away our power—age and self too, into the possession of another; and that which might seem engaging in the beginning may prove a yoke and burden too hard and heavy in the end. Wherefore keep dominion over thyself, and let thy children, good meetings, and Friends be the pleasure of thy life."

Another passage is of interest, not only for the natural way in which it is expressed, but because it gives us a glimpse of his wife, the pretty Guli whom he had married with so much love ten years before.

"Therefore honor and obey her, my dear children, as your mother and your father's love and delight; nay love her too, for she loved your father with a deep and upright love, choosing him above all her many suitors; and though she be of a delicate constitution and noble spirit, yet she descended to the utmost tenderness and care for you, performing the plainest acts of service to you in your infancy, as a mother and a nurse too. I charge you before the Lord, honor and obey, love and cherish, your dear mother."

From this letter we learn also that Penn was at that time already in debt. He lived well, and his family and the public projects in which he was absorbed consumed more than his rather large income. So he begs his wife to be saving. "Remember," he says, "thy mother's example, when thy father's public spiritedness had wasted his estate (which is my case)."

On the 30th of August he embarked at Deal, on board the "Welcome," with about one hundred passengers. About eight weeks afterwards, on the 24th of October, he was within the capes of the Delaware. It had been a long voyage, and, as not infrequently happened in those days, small-pox broke out among the passengers, and thirty died at sea.

Three days more were required for the "Welcome" to beat up the river to New Castle, then the capital, so to speak, or most important village on the Delaware. It was within the territory the Duke of York had given him, and he took possession of it by the delivery of "turf and twig and water," as the ancient feudal form prescribed.

On the 29th of the month he sailed still farther up the river to Upland, where Markham was awaiting him, and this village was within the province of

Pennsylvania. Soon after landing at Upland he turned to his friend Pearson, saying that this was a memorable event, and asking him to name the town; and Pearson gave it the name of his native city, Chester, which it still retains.

We have very few details, and those mostly by tradition, of Penn's doings at this time, and he was not the sort of man to write detailed descriptions of his pleasures. But it is difficult to conceive how these first few weeks, and, indeed, the whole of this first visit to his province, could have been anything but unalloyed delight.

The Delaware was not a river of grand panoramic scenery, like the Hudson, but it had a soft beauty of its own very attractive to some minds; and the complete wildness on every side, with the immense quantities of game, could hardly fail to interest a man like Penn. Its low shores on both sides were mostly open meadows covered with rich grass or reeds, and many of them were overflowed at every high tide. Strips or points of moderately high land covered with forest trees came down through these meadows here and there to the water's edge. Numerous large creeks stretched backward into the wild interior, tempting the explorer at every turn. At low water the river was within its bed, but at high tide it shot outward on every side over the meadows, making vast lakes and bays bordered by the nodding reeds and the points of forest.

The charm of the landscape was the deep, rich green of the grass, the dark, soft soil, where everything seemed fat and fertile, and where animal life

swarmed abundantly. When Penn arrived, at the end of October, the wild ducks must have begun to arrive on those waters. Philadelphia sportsmen would now say that he was too late for the close of the rail-bird season, and had also missed the reed-birds, which a month or so before could have been seen on the marshes in countless millions, rising in great flocks which crossed the sun like a cloud.

There were, indeed, at that time prodigious quantities of game in the air, on the shore, and on the surface of the water. The fish swam innumerable not only in the river, but up every creek. The reach of the river for many miles above and below Chester, where he had stopped, was a famous feeding-ground for the plover and snipe, as well as ducks and all other sorts of birds. In those days there were great flocks of white cranes on the meadows, which are described as rising in clouds when a boat approached the shore ; and in winter there were the wild swans, which have long since been driven far to the south.

The woods back from the shore were full of deer, which the Indians brought in every day and sold for a few pipefuls of tobacco. Markham had written to him, "Partridges I am cloyed with ; we catch them by hundreds at a time." Wild turkeys, Markham said, were also in great abundance, and very easy to shoot. The elk, which in our time have never been heard of east of the Mississippi, were then numerous in Eastern Pennsylvania.

The dikes which now protect many of these meadows from daily overflow had not then been constructed, although it is possible that the Swedish

and Dutch settlers that were scattered along the shores had constructed a few, or dug a few ditches. These Swedes and Dutch, with a few English, had for half a century been enjoying a very prosperous existence, with their houses on the points of upland and their cattle feeding on the meadows or roaming back into the woods, which were then, it is said, very free from undergrowth. They had made no attempt to penetrate the interior forests. Their whole life was centred on the river with what seemed to them its inexhaustible supply of game and fish, and the rich grass of its open meadows, where there were no trees to be felled.

From a letter he afterwards wrote to the Free Society of Traders, we know that Penn was interested in all these things. He must have been very busy asking questions and listening to glowing descriptions, as he looked out over the river with the mellow tints of early autumn on its shores and its green meadows changing into lakes at every tide. It is impossible to suppose that his imagination was not fired at the thought that the river was his and also the dark unpenetrated green forest for three hundred miles to the westward.

He had said in his letter to his children, "Be sure to see with your own eyes and hear with your own ears," and he was prepared to follow this precept. He would see Pennsylvania with his own eyes.

His first excursion from Chester we know of only by tradition. But there is no reason to doubt it, and the excursion must necessarily have been made. He was rowed, it is said, in a barge up the river past

old Tinicum, where the Swedish governor had lived, and where the yacht clubs now anchor their white fleets, past that point which we call League Island, where the war-vessels lie, and round the great bend across the Horseshoe shoals, until the river grew narrow and deeper, and against the western bank it became very deep close to the shore, which was the only really large and good piece of high land with a deep-water frontage. The shore was covered with pines and large hard-wood trees, chestnut, oak, and walnut, with large quantities of laurel, on the leaves of which the deer were fond of feeding, and from the wood of which the Indians made spoons. The bank was steep and high, but at one point a stream flowed through it, deep at its mouth, with a sandy beach, where a settler had already built his cabin. This, said his commissioners, is the spot we have selected for your city.

He landed at the mouth of the little stream ; Dock Creek it was called, and it now flows in the sewer beneath Dock Street. He was delighted with the situation, and readily consented that his city should be there. Some settlers and Indians were at the landing, it is said, to meet him. He sat down with the Indians, so the story goes, and ate their roasted acorns and hominy. Afterwards, when to amuse him they showed him some of their sports, he renewed his college days by joining them in a jumping match, and, much to their surprise, outdid them all.

His commissioners had already planned the town, and had probably marked out some of the streets on the ground ; but he did not like the names they had

given ; so he changed Pool to Walnut Street for the sake of the trees that grew near it, and in the same way Winn was changed to Chestnut Street ; changes which we cannot say were good ones. The name High Street, which he gave to the present Market Street, was, however, a pleasant name, and should have been retained.

He planned the square at Broad and Market Streets, now occupied by the City Hall, but instead of its present size, he intended that it should contain ten acres. He planned also the other four squares known as Washington, Franklin, Logan, and Rittenhouse. In the main, the city is to-day as he intended it should be. He intended that there should be a wide boulevard along the Delaware, and we have now returned to that plan. But he made the streets entirely too narrow for the modern citizens, who suffer much from that part of his design ; and, for the sake of what he thought was modern and convenient, he laid out the whole town on the monotonous chequer-board system, of most dismal effect, very depressing to the people, and a barrier to all attempts at architectural beauty.

We have not the full details of Penn's activity at this time, and even if we had them, it would be tedious to give them all. We know, however, that after seeing that the work on his city was well under way, he went to New York "to pay," it is said, "his duty to the duke by visiting his province ;" but also, no doubt, to see the country. He passed through the Jerseys, visited Long Island, and everywhere preached to any Quakers he found. On his return

it has been supposed that he made his famous treaty with the Indians under the Elm at Kensington; but this is now believed to be a mistake. The treaty, if there was one, was made in the following year.

We know, however, that on his return he worked hard getting his laws and constitution approved. They had been agreed to, provisionally, in England, and under them writs were issued for the election of an assembly, which met December 4, at Chester. The code of laws already described was passed, and was ever after known as the Great Law. An act was also passed, called an Act of Union, annexing to Pennsylvania the land given him by the Duke of York, now known as the State of Delaware, and then called "The Territories" or "the three lower counties." The constitution was also passed, but the Provincial Council and the General Assembly, being ridiculously large, were quickly amended by the Act of Settlement, as it was called, which made the Council consist of eighteen members instead of seventy-two, and the Assembly of thirty-six instead of two hundred.

Then Penn started for Maryland to discuss with Lord Baltimore about the disputed boundary, which remained disputed for the next seventy years. Penn was accompanied by his council, and Lord Baltimore also had his retinue, each trying to impress the other with his dignity and importance. They met at West River, and the fine clothes and pompous arrangements of those times must have made a showy and pretty scene in the wilderness. Lord Baltimore's letters to Penn are very grand and em-

peror-like. Penn's are bluff and plain. He seems to have crossed Chesapeake Bay to the eastern shore and visited a Quaker meeting on the Choptank, and on his return he settled down for the winter at Chester. I am aware that it has been said that he passed the winter at Philadelphia in the Letitia House. But his letters are dated at Chester as late as February, and this seems to me conclusive.

The wild pigeons are described as migrating at that time in such numbers that they almost darkened the air. They often flew so low and were so tame that the colonists knocked them down with sticks and stones; and those that were not immediately used were salted for the winter. Penn, no doubt, saw these great pigeon flights that autumn.

It would be interesting if we knew more of the details of his life during that winter on the river shore at Chester. We should like to know what the ice did that year as the tide forced it in great masses to and fro; how he and the few families round him passed the time. They must all have been living in rude cabins, with the forest behind them and the drifting ice in front. It is strange that those people who for four or five months were with him in the intimacy of long winter evenings in a wilderness have left no account of his sayings and doings. But most of them I suppose were Quakers, and to record such things might have been thought vain.

We know, however, that he was enjoying himself, for he writes to England in high spirits of his travels, the wonders of the country, its game and

fish, the abundance of provisions, the clear air, the twenty-three ships that had arrived so swiftly that few had taken longer than six weeks, and with such good luck that only three were infected with the small-pox.

"O how sweet," he says, "is the quiet of these parts, freed from the anxious and troublesome solicitations, hurries, and perplexities of woful Europe!"

Simple nature, he thinks, is better than base art, and he expresses the desire he often had afterwards of settling with his family in his province.

"I like it so well that a plentiful estate, and a great acquaintance on the other side, have no charms to remove; my family being once fixed with me, and if no other thing occur, I am like to be an adopted American."

In another letter we find that he was under great expense, spending money lavishly in forwarding his enterprise. He did it all for the sake of the people of his faith, and the province, he says, is now in their hands.

"Through my travail, faith, and patience it came. If Friends here keep to God in the justice, mercy, equity, and fear of the Lord their enemies will be their footstool; if not, their heirs, and my heirs too, will lose all, and desolation will follow."

He sent presents of beaver and other furs to the king and the Duke of York; and he wrote letters to important people. As spring opened he renewed his activity. He was again superintending the building of Philadelphia, and probably made excursions there from Chester. Soon, I have no doubt, he went to live in the Letitia House, which had been

THE LETITIA STREET HOUSE

built for him in the town, for in the summer his letters are dated there.

This house his commissioners had placed for him, as he requested, facing the river. It was on Front Street south of the present Market Street, in the centre of a lot which ran back to Second Street, along Market, and included about half the block. There were no houses then between Front Street and the river-shore. The house was of brick, and is still preserved, as we suppose, but has been removed to Fairmount Park. It was always known as the Letitia House because he afterwards gave it, with its large lot, to his daughter. In it, I have no doubt, many of the early meetings of the Provincial Council were held, and it may be considered the first state-house of the province.

Ships were rapidly arriving with immigrants. Some brought with them the frames of houses ready to set up. They lived in huts of bark and turf while they were building their houses, and some dug caves in the river-bank, which then was quite steep. It must have been an interesting scene, with the handsome, accomplished young proprietor—for he was then only thirty-eight years old—moving about among the people and suggesting plans for their houses, while all were stimulated by the novelty of the enterprise and the freshness and excitement of the wilderness.

There were none of the severe privations and dangerous hardships, none of the sickness and famine, which we read of as attending the first settlements of Virginia and Massachusetts. The woods close

round the town were described as swarming with animal life, not only then, but for many years afterwards. There was abundance of everything. It was really a sort of picnic or camping-out party to found a great city. Many of the houses had stone cellars, and were built of both brick and stone, for stone was abundant and bricks were easily made from the clay beds which underlay the soil. This immediate building of brick and stone shows the ease of life and the quick prosperity.

Curious stories have come down by tradition of the pleasant happenings to these people who were enjoying an outing in huts and caves in the river-bank while they were building their substantial houses. A woman was seen sitting at the door of her cave and allowing a snake to share her bowl of porridge, while she called it pet names. Another woman, told by her husband to prepare dinner while he continued to work on the house, went away sad, wondering what she would get. Then she reflected how foolish she was, for was she not enjoying the complete religious liberty she had come for, and when she reached their cave she found her cat had brought in a rabbit, which she served dressed as an English hare. Her name was Morris, and her family down to recent times is said to have preserved a silver box they had had made with the cat and rabbit engraved on it.

A few of the Germans in whom Penn had been interested during his travels in their country had already arrived. Their leader, Pastorius, a heavily learned man after the German manner, was living in

one of the caves in the river-bank, and Penn was much amused by the Latin motto which he put up over the door of his abode: "Parva domus, sed amica bonis, procul este profani."

In March Penn had the Assembly meet again, and the constitution was further amended. An act was passed creating peace-makers to prevent law-suits, and the session of twenty-one days was spent in revising the old laws and enacting new ones. This must have been a busy time with Penn, for he felt bound to use his influence in all these proceedings. His affability, fairness, and frankness of manner seems in these first days of his colony to have won the complete devotion of the people. The Assembly voted him the proceeds of all future taxes on certain exports and imports, which he generously declined for the present. But if he had known the expense and losses that were in store for him he would have retained this golden opportunity of a sure income. The Assembly sharply took advantage of his generosity, repealed the law, and could never again be persuaded to repass it. Twenty years afterwards he wrote of this lost opportunity with the most poignant regret.

He presided over the meetings of the Provincial Council, which seems to have met in the new town, Philadelphia. It frequently sat as a court, and Penn charged the jury. One of the trials was for witch-craft among the Swedes, and the case has been often noticed in colonial history for the quick way in which the ancient superstition was disposed of and prevented from running riot among the people as it

did a few years afterwards in Massachusetts. We have not Penn's charge to the jury, but it is highly probable that he charged against the delusion, for the jury returned a verdict of "guilty of the common fame of being a witch; but not guilty in manner and form as she stands indicted."

In June of this year, 1683, it is probable that he made the treaty with the Indians which has become so famous. There were two treaties or purchases of land made with them that month, one on the 23d, and one on the 25th, and there was also a third one on July 14. It was probably the one on June 23 which has aroused the tradition on which so much imagination has been expended. The document or words of the treaty have not been preserved. In fact, the treaty, so called, was like most of Penn's dealings with the Indians, merely a purchase of land at which certain things were said. He thought nothing of it at the time, for he had adopted the principle of dealing fairly with the Indians and paying them a full and fair price for all their land as he or his province wanted it; and he carried out this principle in all his negotiations with them.

The usual description of this treaty as a formal function, at which the chiefs assembled under the great elm at Kensington on the river-shore just above Philadelphia, Penn appearing with a sky-blue sash around his waist, and all making wonderful speeches, conscious that they were doing a great thing, is all pure imagination and fiction. There is no record or proof whatever of anything of the kind. The speech usually assigned to Penn on

WEST'S PICTURE OF THE GREAT TREATY

that occasion is now known to have been made twenty years afterwards. If such a treaty was made as is supposed to have been made, it was a mere business transaction in the purchase of land, like many that were made about that period and afterwards.

Benjamin West's painting of the scene, which has been so often reproduced, is largely responsible for the growth of this treaty myth. Writers have taken the picture as a fact and written up to it. Historically considered, the picture is all wrong. West merely guessed or supposed that there had been such a scene. Penn, who at that time, according to all the accounts we have of him, was a vigorous young man of thirty-eight, is represented as fat, short, and old; and he and his companions are dressed in clothes which were not worn until nearly half a century afterwards.

On one point, however, there is no question. The Indians always retained a distinct tradition of a treaty of some sort with Penn, or rather of some promises he had made which he always kept; and his keeping them was the great point. It is supposed that Penn refers to these promises in his letter to the Free Society of Traders, written August 16, of that year, 1683, about two months after the land purchase of June 23.

"When the purchase was agreed, great promises passed between us, of kindness and good neighbourhood, and that the Indians and English must live in love as long as the sun gave light: which done, another made a speech to the Indians, in the name of all the Sachamakan, or kings, first to tell them what was done; next, to

charge and command them to love the Christians, and particularly live in peace with me and the people under my government. That many governors had been in the river, but that no governor had come himself to live and stay here before; and having now such an one that had treated them well, they should never do him or his any wrong. At every sentence of which they shouted, and said, Amen, in their way."

We have the records of speeches made by the Indians at treaties many years afterwards, in which they refer to these promises made of old by Penn; and their description of the promises closely resembles what Penn describes in his letter to the Society of Traders. The Indians said that they often assembled in the woods and spread out a blanket, on which they laid all the words of Penn, that they might go over them and refresh their memories. By this they meant that they laid on the blanket the belts of wampum, each of which represented a clause of the promises or treaty. Each belt had been originally given to an Indian, with the clause he was to remember; and it was in this way that they preserved what civilized nations preserve in documents.

The substance of the promises was merely that the Indians were to be treated fairly and not defrauded. There was nothing wonderful in this. Such treaties had been made before with Indians and with savages of all sorts from the dawn of history. Almost thirty years before Penn's arrival, when the Swedes controlled the Delaware, their governor, Rising, had made a treaty with the Indians with similar promises. Soon afterwards the Quakers of Burlington, New Jersey, made the same sort of treaty of friendship. Penn

was doing nothing remarkable, nothing which required a formal celebration or the exhibition of himself in a sky-blue sash; and no one at the time thought of these land purchases or treaties as in any way wonderful.

It was after-events and not the treaty itself which made it famous. The Indians had often before and often after heard fair promises. But Penn kept his, not merely in his own opinion or in the opinion of his followers, but in the opinion of the Indians. As ten, fifteen, twenty, and thirty years rolled by, and the Indians found every word of the treaty fulfilled by Mignon, as the Delawares called him, or Onas, as he was called by the Iroquois, the fame of the one white man and Christian who could keep his faith with the savage spread far and wide, and the savage sent it across the Atlantic.

In France and on the continent of Europe the great men and writers seized upon it as the most remarkable occurrence of the age. To these men, brought up under Latin Christianity and accustomed to the atrocities and horrors inflicted by Cortes and Pizarro on the natives of South America, the thought of a Christian keeping his promise inviolate for forty years with heathen Indians was idealism realized. It was like refreshment in a great weary desert. Who was the man, and what queer sort of Christian was he that he kept his word with the heathen; that he had done what had never been done before, and what it was supposed never would be done?

Voltaire was delighted. From that time he loved

the Quakers, and even thought of going to Pennsylvania to live among them. Soon he wrote of the great treaty the immortal sentence, "This was the only treaty between these people and the Christians that was not ratified by an oath and that was never broken."

Raynal said,—

"Here it is the mind rests with pleasure upon modern history and feels some kind of compensation for the disgust, melancholy, and horror which the whole of it, but particularly that of the European settlement in America, inspires."

No other part of Penn's career gave him such fame, so wide-spread and so well deserved, as this. He stood alone and supreme, and, so far as the United States is concerned, he has stood alone ever since. No one of us, certainly not our government at Washington, has ever kept its faith with the Indians for a stretch of forty years.

In Penn's case the period was even longer than that in the good results that followed from his conduct. Pennsylvania was at peace with the Indians not only during his lifetime, but for long after his death; in fact, for almost seventy-five years, or until the French and Indian Wars, which began in 1755. This gave the province an enormous advantage over the other colonies, which were continually harassed and checked in their growth by Indian hostilities, so that Pennsylvania, which was founded long after most of them, caught up to and surpassed nearly all in population and material prosperity. When the French war began, in 1755, the frontier population

SUPPOSED WAMPUM BELT OF THE GREAT TREATY

of Pennsylvania were almost without weapons, and so unaccustomed to warfare that the first invaders swept everything before them.*

The first settlers of Pennsylvania, either because they were Quakers, or through the influence of Penn, seem to have been on the most friendly terms with the Indians. From the letters of the time we learn that they were received by both the Swedes and the Indians with a very hearty welcome. Indians meeting children in the woods directed them home, that they might not be lost.

"And their parents, about that time, going to the yearly meeting, and leaving a young family at home, the Indians would come every day to see that nothing was amiss among them."

Richard Townsend, one of the first settlers, gives Penn the credit for this mildness of the Indians.

"As our worthy proprietor treated the Indians with extraordinary humanity, they became very civil and loving to us, and brought in abundance of venison. As in other countries the Indians were exasperated by hard treatment, which hath been the foundation of much bloodshed, the contrary treatment here hath produced their love and affection." (Proud's History of Pennsylvania, vol. i. p. 229.)

A letter written by Penn in the summer of that year, 1683, after he had finished the land purchases from the Indians, reports that fifty sail of vessels had arrived within the past year, about eighty houses had been built in Philadelphia, and about three hundred farms laid out round the town. It is supposed that about three thousand immigrants had arrived.

* For a full discussion of this subject, see "Pennsylvania: Colony and Commonwealth," chap. vii.

This was very gratifying success; and while he was enjoying it, he was amused to hear that in England he was reported to have died in his province and confessed himself a Jesuit. To familiarize himself more thoroughly with his friends, the Indians, and with the resources of his delightful colony, this unarmed Quaker made an extended journey on horseback into the interior, reaching, it is supposed, the Susquehanna River. In a printed paper called "Proposals for a Second Settlement in the Province of Pennsylvania," now in the American Philosophical Society, he seems to be describing what he had seen on this journey, and he speaks of the large herds of elk on the Susquehanna. He also seems to refer to this journey in his "Further Account of the Province," written in 1685. He lived in the Indians' wigwams, and learned much of their language and customs. It is to be regretted that he did not keep a minute journal of this tour. We know only, from a chance passage in Oldmixon,* that he went, and the time and length of his journey is uncertain.

He summed up, however, all that he knew of the province in a long letter to the Free Society of Traders, which was published and translated into several languages. This society was a corporation which he had had organized to encourage settlers and development; but it was never successful. His letter, however, is very interesting. It shows a most keen and careful observation, and a passionate

* British Empire in America, vol. i. p. 161. See also Buck's Penn in America, p. 132.

fondness for the province, which is one of many incidents that convince us that it would have been much better if he had always lived in the colony and governed it in person. It would have been a better commonwealth, closer to his ideals, and his personal government would have been a most interesting chapter in human history.

His descriptions of the climate, soil, trees, and various conditions almost startle the modern reader in their absolute accuracy. He was evidently a great lover of nature. This we might have already inferred from many of his maxims and from his living so much in the country in England. But this letter to the Society of Traders shows a very ardent love and a great deal of knowledge of natural things, which was not to be expected from a man who had spent so much time on theology, languages, and the biographies of Greeks, Romans, and the fathers of the church.

He describes with great particularity the trees and the plants which we find in the woods to-day. We learn from him that the climate has not changed, either in winter or in summer. He tells us what we learn also from other sources, and what surprised him very much, that the woods were then quite open and free from underbrush. In another letter he says that a coach could be driven through them for twenty miles round Philadelphia; and in a letter to Lord Sunderland he speaks of "many open spaces that have been old Indian fields." With not a little pride, he tells the Society of Traders that the whole royal navy could be laid up in one of the large creeks

that flowed into his mighty Delaware. He gives much space to the Indians and their customs, which he had studied minutely. They would never give any trouble. It was the easiest thing in the world to manage them. Simply be just. He tells us of the elk and all the animals of the woods, the wild turkeys, the pheasants, the pigeons, the swans, brant, ducks, snipe, and curlews in vast numbers; the large oysters down the bay; and he enumerates the shad and all the fish we have long known in the river. When he makes his only mistake it is not his own, but because he quotes the report of others, as when he writes, "Some say salmon above the Falls." *

He was determined to enjoy to the full the wild nature which he took so much pleasure in describing, and he had a country place, which he called Pennsbury, laid out for himself on the river about twenty miles above Philadelphia, near where Bristol now stands. But as it was scarcely finished in time for him to live there during this visit we must defer the description of it to another chapter.

Soon after writing the letter to the Society of Traders he had to return to England. The most pressing reason for his going seems to have been the controversy with Lord Baltimore about the Maryland boundary. They had failed to agree on a compromise, and the question must be argued before the Committee of Trades and Plantations of the Privy Council. Lord Baltimore had already set out,

* The Falls were the rapids in the Delaware where Trenton now stands.

concealing his departure from Penn so as to get the start of him and make interest before he arrived.

Penn also had a reason for returning in his desire to see his family again. He may possibly have been influenced by the thought that he ought to return to his old life of protecting the Quakers from persecution in England. He received from one of his old friends, William Crisp, a whining letter, such as over-good people sometimes write, telling him in a sort of indirect way that he was neglecting the interest of truth and the testimony of God for the sake of governing a colony, and rather implying that he was seeking his own selfish interests.

But Penn had, I think, too much sense to be led by anything this pious goose would say to him. In any event, he had to go home for the boundary dispute, and leave the wholesome pleasures and interests of his province, which would have been better and always was the better for his immediate presence. So home he sailed, August 16, 1684, on a little ship of a kind called in those days a ketch. She was not so slow, however, for her size and the times, for she made the passage in seven weeks.

XVII

RETURNS TO ENGLAND AND BECOMES A COURTIER

When he arrived in England the officious Stephen Crisp was quick to inform him of the talk among the Quakers that he had sanctioned military proceedings in Pennsylvania, was growing very rich, had deprived the Swedes of their land, and other tales which always delight the gossips of both sexes. But Penn took notice of such stuff only to deny it. More important matters demanded his attention.

He found his people as hard pressed by the laws as ever. He talked to the king and the duke only to find them sour and stern. They believed that the opposition which made their government uneasy came from dissenters of all sorts, and they would make such people yield or break them. Under these circumstances Penn found himself in a curious position.

"One day I was received well at court as proprietor and governor of a province of the crown and the next taken up at a meeting by Hilton and Collingwood and the third smoakt and informed of for meeting with the men of the whig stamp."

In leaving Pennsylvania he had, with characteristic carelessness, neglected to bring with him the most important papers in the boundary case ; or, rather, he had instructed one of his servants to bring them,

and neglected to see that he did it before sailing. He wrote a very angry letter on the subject, for the delay of many months in sending across the ocean for the papers was both exasperating and dangerous. Meantime, he comforted himself by writing instructions for improving his country seat, Pennsbury, which he had taken such pleasure in establishing in the province. He took great delight in sending out seeds for Ralph, the gardener, and in writing all manner of directions to his steward, James Harrison, whom he had left in charge of the place. Among other things he sent him wine and beer, some to be sold for his account and the rest to be stored at Pennsbury to improve by age.

For serious public occupation he set to work on his old subject, liberty of conscience. There was no use in arguing or striving for a general liberty with the government in such a morose temper. "I therefore," he says, "sought out some bleeding cases, which was not hard to do." One in particular he devoted himself to, the case of Richard Vickris, a very quiet man who was under sentence of death for his religion, for refusing to swear, and for violating statutes for the suppression of dissenters. Penn appealed on his behalf to the duke, and the duke to the king; and Penn succeeded. Vickris was pardoned.

Penn relates that he had to proceed carefully in public matters, lest by offending the government he might injure his case against Lord Baltimore. But he went so far as to write out an argument to show that in the violent party heats, and the factions into

which the kingdom was nearly equally divided, the crown should gratify neither extreme party, but rule wisely over all. This argument he presented to the king in manuscript, for the times, he tells us, were "too set and rough for print;" and they must have, indeed, been very rough if Penn was unwilling to print his opinions.

In the winter of 1684–85 Charles II. died of a stroke of apoplexy, as most historians tell us. But Bishop Burnet always insisted on believing that he was poisoned by the Jesuits because he was on the eve of breaking away from them and allowing some liberal reforms. We cannot, however, discuss here the bishop's interesting proofs on this subject. The gay, careless king was dead, and his brother, the Roman Catholic Duke of York, took the throne as James II.

Penn wrote an account of these events to Thomas Lloyd, in Pennsylvania, and in this letter mentioned that he had thus far lost by the province £3000, while the speculators who had bought land from him were growing rich. The next year he announces that he has lost £5000. He hoped, however, to return to his colony in the autumn.

With his own particular friend and his father's friend, the Duke of York, on the throne, Penn was in a stronger and more influential position than ever. He could now go directly to the crown for favors, and be tolerably well assured of success. But there was in this intimacy and success, as we shall soon see, a great danger. James II. was by no means disposed to keep his Romanism a secret,

as his brother had done. His whole family went openly to mass, and he himself began to advance the cause of his religion by allowing the Jesuits to build a college in London. He sent an ambassador to Rome, and received one from the Pope. How long would the English people, who dreaded the Pope and his religion more than they dreaded France or the plague, endure such a king? And what would happen to the Quaker, already suspected of Jesuitism, who was his favorite?

But Penn was not much accustomed to calculating on risks of this kind; and it is easy to see how in the first instance he was led into closer relations with James. He expected from him religious liberty, and great relief to the Quakers. James promised this, and spoke so beautifully about liberty that he seemed to be putting Protestants and Whigs to shame. Within a year or so he was as good as his word. The Quakers had sent him a petition showing that thirteen hundred of their faith were then in prison, and that in the last five years hundreds of them had died of prison hardships. Within a year, by a proclamation of King James, they were every one set at liberty, along with all the other dissenters, and a large number of Roman Catholics, who were in prison for their religion.

We are not informed of the exact number of these prisoners at this time; but as there were about thirteen hundred Quakers, there must have been at least as many more of other sects; so that we can say that several thousand came trooping out of the noisome pest-houses in which they had been

confined, and fathers and brothers, even sisters, wives, and mothers, were restored to their families. It was a strange condition of society which we now can scarcely understand, such a jail delivery as this of people who had been imprisoned for years for nothing but their religion. There was great rejoicing all over England, especially among the Quakers, who at their next annual meeting in London saw the faces of valued friends, some of whom, according to their historian, Gough, had been in prison "twelve or fifteen years and upward."

Penn's biographers have been inclined to describe this wonderful delivery in such a way that the reader infers that Penn was the cause of it. But this is hardly fair to the reader or to Penn. The delivery was part of a deep policy adopted by the king. He wanted to deliver the people of his own religion. He could not very well deliver them without delivering all the others, and in delivering others he thought he would win them to his side and accomplish certain purposes he had in view. What part Penn had in the delivery, or whether he had any, cannot now be determined. But there is no doubt that, along with others, he had for years been advocating such a delivery, and we can easily believe that he worked hard for his own thirteen hundred. Was he not, therefore, more than ever bound by gratitude, policy, and every other tie to the king, who had done more for the Quakers than his predecessor, who passed for a Protestant.

Gerard Croese, the historian of the Quakers, has described for us Penn's intimacy with the king.

"William Penn was greatly in favor with the king—the Quaker's sole patron at court—on whom the hateful eyes of his enemies were intent. The king loved him as a singular and entire friend, and imparted to him many of his secrets and counsels. He often honored him with his company in private, discoursing with him of various affairs, and that, not for one, but many hours together, and delaying to hear the best of his peers who at the same time were waiting for an audience. One of these being envious, and impatient of delay, and taking it as an affront to see the other more regarded than himself, adventured to take the freedom to tell his majesty, that when he met with Penn he thought little of his nobility. The king made no other reply, than that Penn always talked ingenuously, and he heard him willingly." ("General History of the Quakers," p. 106.)

But a horrible thing occurred which one might suppose would try Penn to the utmost. The young Duke of Monmouth, the attractive and accomplished, but illegitimate son of Charles II. made a dash at the throne, relying on his popularity with the people, which was great and secured him many Protestant followers. His insurrection was put down, and a terrible slaughter made among those who had assisted or even passively assented to his rebellion. Judge Jeffreys, of whom we have read so much, and whom Macaulay describes with such vividness, went up and down the country condemning to execution with the delight of a fiend, and roaring curses at his victims. Soon their bleeding heads and quarters were ornamenting almost every village in the western counties near where Monmouth had landed, a shocking sight to modern eyes, but one on which the men and even women of that age could look with comparative indifference.

One would suppose that such cruel wholesale vengeance would have shaken Penn's regard for the

king; but it did not. "The king," he said, "was much to be pitied, who was hurried into all this effusion of blood by Jeffrey's impetuous and cruel temper." He writes of these events to his steward at Pennsbury in the matter-of-fact way men wrote of such things in those days; for no one then spoke of cruelty with the excitement and horror which are now used.

"About three hundred hanged in divers towns in the West, about one thousand to be transported. I begged twenty of the king. Col. Holmes, young Hays, the two Hewlings, Lark, and Hix, ministers, are executed. . . . There is daily inquisition for those engaged in the late plots, some die denying, as Alderman Cornish, others confessing but justifying. . . . A woman, one Gaunt of Wappen, of Doct. Moore's acquaintance, was burned the same day at Tyburn for the high treason of hiding one of Monmouth's army, and the man saved came in against her. She died composedly and fearless, interpreting the cause of her death God's cause. Many more to be hanged, great and small. It is a day to be wise."

By saying that it was a day to be wise, Penn probably meant that in such a turmoil of affairs Quakers had best stand aside, be quiet and prudent, and get what relief they could. It is to be observed that of those to be transported, he begged twenty of the king, and these, it is supposed, he sent to Pennsylvania. This saved them from the worse fate of a penal colony. But whether he was able at this time to save anybody's life is not known.

He has been charged, however, by Macaulay in his History of England, with being concerned at this time in a most nefarious transaction. The victims of the rebellion were so numerous that many low pardon-brokers and courtiers were driving a very

thriving trade in selling ransoms. Some little girls, it seems, had by the direction of their school-mistress, marched in a procession when Monmouth landed. The maids of honor at court demanded these girls as their share of the spoil, and when this was granted informed the parents of the children that seven thousand pounds would save them. William Penn, says Macaulay, was the go-between selected to extort this money.

If this charge is true, Penn was a contemptible villain, the virtues usually ascribed to him mere hypocrisy, and we should forget as soon as possible that he ever lived, and change the name of Pennsylvania. When, however, we examine the evidence on which Macaulay relied, we find that it is a letter written by Lord Sunderland to a Mr. Penne, asking him to undertake the task in company with a Mr. Walden. There is no evidence that the Mr. Penne accepted the offer, or that he was the same person as William Penn, and it is well known that there was at that time a notorious pardon-broker named George Penne. Moreover, Oldmixon, a contemporary authority, tells us that Brent, the popish lawyer, was the agent who finally acted for the maids of honor, Macaulay, as sometimes happened, was hasty in his investigations as well as in his conclusions.

He also sneers at Penn for attending, at this time, the executions of Cornish and Elizabeth Gaunt.

"William Penn, for whom exhibitions, which humane men generally avoid, seem to have had a strong attraction, hastened from Cheapside where he had seen Cornish hanged to Tyburn in order to see Elizabeth Gaunt burnt."

Macaulay is very careless in asserting that humane men generally avoid such exhibitions. They do now; but they did not then. The admirers and friends of a victim or martyr usually made a point of going to see him die. Evelyn, who was a devoted adherent of Charles I., went to his execution, and calmly describes it in his diary.

Elizabeth Gaunt had concealed one of the Monmouth rebels in her house. He informed on her and was allowed to go free, while she perished. Bishop Burnet, in his "History of his Own Times," tells us how Penn described to him both her death and Cornish's, and Penn's description shows the spirit in which he viewed these shocking events.

"She rejoiced that God had honoured her to be the first that suffered by fire in this reign; and that her suffering was a martyrdom for that religion which was all love. Pen, the quaker told me, he saw her die. She laid the straw about her for burning her speedily; and behaved herself in such a manner, that all the spectators melted in tears. . . .

"Cornish, at his death, asserted his innocence with great vehemence; and with some acrimony complained of the methods taken to destroy him. And so they gave it out, that he died in a fit of fury. But Pen who saw the execution, said to me, there appeared nothing but a just indignation that innocence might very naturally give. Pen might be well relied on in such matters, he being so entirely in the king's interests." (History of his Own Times," pp. 649, 651.)

It must be confessed, however, that Penn, in becoming a courtier and associating with the sycophants and corruptionists which at that time crowded the court, ran a great risk of being confused with them, and accused of their crimes. He was himself an obtainer of pardons, and obtained many of them;

but as we are assured from several sources that he took no pay, he cannot be called one of the pardon-brokers, of whom he must often have seen many at court. It was, however, in accordance with his principles to disregard all such risks as this. He found he had an influence with the king, and he was determined to use it to assist the Quakers and all others who were suffering from the tyranny of the times.

But in one respect he was very blind, perhaps deliberately blind, to the condition of things. In a letter to his steward at Pennsbury, he shows that he was well aware of what the Roman Catholics were doing in other countries. It seems almost incredible that he did not realize what he would be supporting if he supported a king like James.

"In France, not a meeting of Protestants left, they force all, by not suffering them to sleep, to conform; they use drums or fling water on the drowsy till they submit or run mad. . . . Such as fly and are caught are executed or sent to the galleys to row. . . . Believe me it is an extraordinary day, such as has not been since generations ago. Read this to weighty friends and magistrates in private."

From the last injunction it would seem that he did not want this letter to be made public and come back to England to be read at court. He was in a delicate position with his boundary case still pending before the Privy Council, the burden of obtaining relief for the people of his faith, and compelled to obtain the relief from such a source as James II.

Some one wrote verses extolling the king and popery and signed them with Penn's initials. It was a petty trick, but in the prevailing excitement it helped to spread the suspicion that he was a Jesuit.

He had to write a long statement to deny the authorship and offset the effect of the verses. About the same time he discovered that Dr. Tillotson, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, had been reporting him as in correspondence with the Jesuits at Rome; and he had to write several letters to set Tillotson right.

But if some were inclined to attack his reputation, because of his intimacy with the king, there were others who for the same reason sought his assistance. He rapidly became a very active and influential courtier, and soon had all the business in this line that he could handle.

In modern times the British government is carried on by the cabinet officers or ministry, and divided into great and permanently organized departments. Those who have favors to ask or claims to press deal with the officials of these departments or with parliamentary committees. But in Penn's time there was none of this system. Government by ministry had not been developed to its present form; nor was Parliament so important as it is now. The king was the source of all favors and the authority for the allowance of claims. His assent must first be obtained before the machinery of the departments could be set in motion.

So the courtiers—the men who by their manners, accomplishments, political sagacity, or influence with sects or parties were most pleasing to the king—became the middlemen, or attorneys and agents, to help on the affairs of the crowd of suitors. It was business, but it was managed in a strolling way, as pleas-

antly as possible, so as to seem not like business, but as part of the gracious favor or amusement of his Majesty. Judging from Pepys's "Diary" and other books, the courtiers managed a great many of their affairs and collected information and gossip walking to and fro with one another or with their clients in the gardens or in the corridors of White Hall. They saw the king as best they could: sometimes when he was dressing in the morning, which was a favorite time with Charles II. for receiving visitors.

We have already seen how Penn secured from the king a pardon for Vickris. Soon afterwards he obtained a pardon for his college-mate, John Locke, who was an exile in Holland. But the proud philosopher declined it. He had done nothing, he said, which required a pardon.

Penn's friendship and influence with the king being now well established, the demands on him became incessant, and Gerard Croese tells us of his busy life.

"Penn, being so highly favored, acquired thereby a number of friends. Those also who formerly knew him, when they had any favor to ask at court, came to, courted, and entreated Penn to promote their several requests. Penn refused none of his friends any reasonable office he could do for them, but was ready to serve them all, but more especially the Quakers, and these wherever their religion was concerned. It is usually thought, when you do me one favor readily, you thereby encourage me to expect a second. Thus they ran to Penn without intermission, as their only pillar and support, who always caressed and received them cheerfully, and effected their business by his influence and eloquence. Hence his house and gates were daily thronged by a numerous train of clients and suppliants, desiring him to present their addresses to his Majesty. There were sometimes two hundred and more. When the carrying on of these affairs required money for writings, such as drawing things out into form and copyings, and for fees and other charges which are

usually made on such occasions, Penn so discreetly managed matters, that out of his own, which he had in abundance, he liberally discharged many emergent expenses." ("General History of the Quakers," p. 106.)

We are not informed of the various kinds of cases Penn managed for his clients. A great deal of his business was obtaining pardons, for, in that age of turmoil, rebellions, and civil war, there were hundreds of people constantly in exile or in danger of death. There were many pardon-brokers about the court, and some of them were very nefarious in their operations, demanding enormous sums or all a man's estate for saving his life. Penn, however, we are assured, took no fees.

There was a certain Charlewood Lawton, who had taken part in Monmouth's rebellion and had been obliged to hide himself in the moorlands of Staffordshire; but being relieved from apprehension when the general pardon was published, Penn sought him out and made friends with him in that cordial manner which he seems to have bestowed on so many people to whom he took a fancy. Lawton, in return, became a great admirer of Penn, and in a memoir he left speaks with enthusiasm of his "inexhaustible spring of benevolence towards all his fellow-creatures, without any narrow or stingy regard to either civil or religious parties." After telling how Penn at his request obtained a free pardon for Aaron Smith, who was about to buy one by the surrender of his whole estate, Lawton gives a description which throws some light on Penn's manner and the times.

"After dinner as we were drinking a glass of wine, Mr. Penn, turning to him, told Mr. Popple that he had brought him such a man as he had never met with before. 'I have just now asked him how I might do something for himself, and he hath desired me to get pardon for another man.' And so Mr. Penn repeated at length what had passed between us upon the terrace walk, and then turning to me, he said, 'though I will, at thy request, get, if I can, Aaron Smith's pardon, yet I desire thou wilt think of something wherein I can do a kindness for thyself.'

"Upon that I said I could tell him how he might prolong my life. Mr. Penn replied, 'I am no physician, but prithee tell me what thou meanest?' And so I told him Jack Trenchard (for so we State Whigs used to call him) who was afterwards Secretary of State, was abroad, and if he could get him leave to come home with safety and honor, the drinking now and then a bottle with Jack Trenchard would make me so cheerful, that it would prolong my life.

"To this Mr. Penn smilingly answered, 'To show thee I will not deny thee anything thou canst reasonably ask, I promise thee I will get him too a pardon, if I can;' and after this we chatted half an hour, and so parted.

"In three weeks or a month he got Aaron Smith's pardon; and prevailing with my Lord Jefferies (then Lord Chancellor) to join with him, they in a short time obtained Mr. Trenchard's." (Memoirs, Penna. Hist. Soc., vol. iii. part ii. p. 215.)

This throng of clients compelled Penn to live at Kensington in London. He rented Holland House, a handsome residence belonging to the Earl of Warwick; and he led a very expensive life, keeping a coach and four and other extravagances. He may have seemed to have been paying the expenses of his Quaker clients out of his own abundance, as Croese calls it; but that abundance was being rapidly drained, for in addition to his other expenses he was losing money by Pennsylvania. He was paying all the expenses of government there, and the officials had a bad habit of drawing on him

for whatever they wanted, as if he were an inexhaustible mine.

"I have had two letters more," he writes to his steward, "with three bills of exchange. I am sorry the public is so unmindful of me as not to prevent bills upon me that am come on their errand, and had rather have lost a thousand pounds, than have stirred from Pennsylvania. . . . James, send no more bills, for I have enough to do to keep all even here, and think of returning with my family; that can't be without vast charge."

His heart was set on enjoying again the simple, honest pleasures of his wilderness colony, and never leaving them. But he was held fast in England not only by the dispute with Lord Baltimore, but by the critical condition of politics and the demands of the Quakers. He was in too deep with the king to get out. Neither his conscience nor his ambition could quite permit him to drop the important public position in which he had suddenly found himself since the accession of James.

In the spring of 1686, shortly before the king set at liberty the thirteen hundred Quakers with the other dissenters, Penn wrote an important pamphlet called "A Persuasive to Moderation." It was his old subject, liberty of conscience, but he argues it out afresh with new suggestions. It is in some respects one of his best arguments on this subject, which he handled so often, for in this instance he takes particular pains to give instances where toleration had proved itself a political and commercial success. He begins, of course, with ancient times and the flourishing state of the Roman empire, which tolerated over thirty thousand different religious rites among

her people. But he soon comes down to his own time, and gives numerous instances of the success of toleration in the small states of Europe and in most of the British colonies in America. He considered himself as proving conclusively by these that toleration never endangered monarchy.

His most important instance, of course, is Holland, "that bog of the world," as he calls it, "neither sea nor dry land, now the rival of the tallest monarchies; not by conquests, marriages, or accession of royal blood, the usual ways of empire, but by her own superlative clemency and industry." Then he goes on to show that toleration gave security to property, which could never be secure when estates were at any moment liable to be swept away by the sheriff to pay the fines for religious dissent.

Then he speaks of the Declaration of Indulgence in the last reign, which, by relieving the dissenters from persecution, greatly encouraged trade. So long as the indulgence lasted, "all men," he says, "labored cheerfully and traded boldly when they had the royal word to keep what they got." He does not seem, however, to realize sufficiently that it was a dangerous violation of the constitution to allow the king to suspend laws even to accomplish such a good purpose. He had not then written his maxim, "To do evil that good may come of it, is for bunglers in politics as well as morals."

He calls the Declaration of Indulgence the "sovereign remedy of our English constitution." Such an indulgence, he thinks, will be the panacea for all

political ills. If full religious liberty were allowed the dissenters, they would all, he says, be united in favor of the government, and such rebellions as Monmouth's and such designs as the Rye House plot would cease. This last was a sound suggestion; but it was not sound to favor granting that liberty by allowing the king to suspend the laws, and it is surprising to find Penn in effect arguing for another declaration of indulgence.

Penn afterwards spoke of this pamphlet as having not a little circulation and influence, and he was not a man who was conceited about his own writings or over-estimated them. Whether it influenced the king or not, the king was on this occasion wiser than Penn, for he merely pardoned the dissenters who were in prison, which he had a right to do, without attempting as yet to violate constitutional right by suspending the laws.

Penn and the Quakers were, of course, well pleased with this result; but Penn seems to have known that things were not quite so rosy as they seemed. In writing to his steward, after saying how he longs to be back again in Pennsylvania, but "great undertakings" crowd him, he says,—

> "The Lord keep us here in this dark day. Be wise, close, respectful to superiors. The king has discharged all Friends by a general pardon, and is courteous to us, though as to the Church of England things seem pinching. Several Roman Catholics get much into places in the army, navy, and court."

So Penn was well aware that the king was "pinching" the Church of England. The letter is somewhat guarded; but Penn evidently saw that the king

had pardoned the dissenters for the sake of avoiding their hostility for a time, while he worked Roman Catholics into power and turned both government and church over to Rome. This, Penn says, made a "dark day;" and he must have foreseen that when the people once fully realized what the king was doing, there would be a terrible outbreak of some kind. He was powerless to turn the king from this course; and we do not know that he even tried at this time. His influence extended only to obtaining favors for individuals.

Why, then, did he continue to stand in with the king? It was his only way of obtaining relief for the Quakers, and this was certainly a great temptation when thirteen hundred of them had just been released. As for a general liberty of conscience established by law, he apparently had no hope of it at that time, except in Pennsylvania. In England liberty must be picked up as you could get it. He had to protect from interference both Pennsylvania and the Jerseys, and he had his litigation with Lord Baltimore. These important interests might all be injured by losing favor at court.

It is curious to note that for a time after the king had pardoned everybody who was in jail for their religion, the magistrates and judges continued to enforce the laws against dissenters; the informers continued to pry about, and constables made arrests. A person who had just been let out by the pardon might, by a zealous magistrate, be locked up again for a fresh offence. Penn himself, though he was so intimate with the king and daily obtaining favors for

his clients, was not safe from the magistrates and informers, who would send constables to "pull him down" while he was preaching. "I have been thrice," he writes to his steward, "taken at meetings, but got off, blessed be God."

It was a strange condition of affairs, and Penn was leading a strange life; so influential with the king that he had become a courtier with hundreds of clients, and at the same time going out to preach to the Quakers, the supposed enemies of the government, and pulled down for it by constables and soldiers. The king, however, after a time stopped the magistrates and constables, so that the laws against dissenters stood on the books unexecuted.

In the summer of this year, 1686, Penn made a third journey to Holland and Germany. It was partly a political and partly a religious journey, but of the religious part we know little or nothing, because he has left us no account of it. But we may infer that he spoke much of Pennsylvania and urged the Mennonites, Schwenkfelders, and other Quaker-like German sects to migrate to his province, as many of them did. The Quaker historian, Sewell, was then engaged in translating into Dutch Penn's description of Pennsylvania, and also "No Cross, No Crown," and Penn met him in Holland. Of the political part of the journey, however, something is known, and it is important, because it shows how Penn was becoming more and more involved in the schemes of the king.

Whether the king actually commissioned him to visit, in Holland, William, the Prince of Orange, is

not certain, but, at any rate, he did so and advocated the king's policy. The Prince of Orange had married James's daughter Mary, who would succeed to the throne if James had no son, and, as things happened, she and the prince took the throne from James by violence two years afterwards. The object of Penn's visit was to persuade the prince, whose wife was heir presumptive to the crown, to agree that there should be not only freedom of religious worship in England, but that the test laws, which kept both Roman Catholics and dissenters out of Parliament and office, should be abolished. William was an ardent and liberal Protestant, and as sincere a believer in religious liberty as Penn. He readily agreed that there should be freedom of worship not only to dissenters, but to papists; but he very naturally declined to have a hand in removing the test laws which blocked a Roman Catholic king from turning over to Rome the British government and church.

Bishop Burnet, who was then at William's court, has described Penn's efforts and William's answer in a passage which is well worth quoting.

"But for the tests he would enter into no treaty about them. He said it was a plain betraying the security of the Protestant religion to give them up. Nothing was left unsaid that might move him to agree to this in the way of interest. The king would enter into an entire confidence with him, and would put his best friends in the chief trusts. Pen undertook for this so positively, that he seemed to believe it himself, or he was a great proficient in the art of dissimulation. Many suspected that he was a concealed Papist. It is certain he was much with Father Peter, and was particularly trusted by the Earl of Sunderland. So tho' he did not pretend any com-

mission for what he promised, yet we looked on him as a man employed. To all this the Prince answered, that no man was more for toleration in principle than he was: He thought the conscience was only subject to God: And as far as a general toleration, even of Papists, would content the king, he would concur in it heartily: But he looked on the Tests as such a real security, and indeed the only one, when the king was of another religion, that he would join in no counsels with those that intended to repeal those laws that enacted them. Pen said the king would have all or nothing: But that if this was once done the king would secure the toleration by a solemn and unalterable law. To this the late repeal of the edict of Nantes that was declared perpetual and irrevocable furnished an answer that admitted of no reply." ("Burnet's History of his Own Times," vol. i. 693, 694.)

It is strange that Penn should have been willing to press such a request; for he knew that James II. was drawing Roman Catholics into office as fast as he could in spite of the tests. Penn might, perhaps, have defended himself by saying that he believed in absolute religious liberty without restrictions or tests of any kind. To which William of Orange would very justly have replied that such complete liberty might be possible some day; but at the present time the tests must be retained in order to keep the Roman Catholics out of power; for all English history had shown that, if once in full control, they would organize the worst sort of religious despotism.

William, as Burnet tells us, had about that time seen an intercepted letter of the Jesuits in which they boasted that James had declared that he would establish the Roman religion in England, or die a martyr in the attempt.*

* Burnet's History of his Own Times, vol. i. p. 711.

William also, of course, wanted the tests retained to keep out of power the dissenters who would destroy the Church of England. His theory which he afterwards put into practice, and which proved to be the sound one, was to protect the English Church, keep it in power, and keep dissenters, Roman and otherwise, out of power; at the same time allowing all of them complete freedom, so far as concerned their worship. The British government has been conducted on this principle with gradual relaxation of it down into our own time.

Penn on this occasion seems to have been utterly lacking in common shrewdness. While professing himself a lover of liberty and a Protestant, he was appearing at the court of the future King of England, as the dupe and tool of James II., a Roman Catholic and well known to be an enemy of liberty. He made himself very unpopular with important people who were really his friends, and laid up a store of trouble for himself. The followers of the Prince of Orange learned to despise him, and that talking and very violent follower Bishop Burnet acquired for him a relentless antipathy which he afterwards took no pains to conceal.

As for the prince himself, he was supremely strong in the quality in which Penn was weak. He saw through and through human nature at a glance. He wasted no antipathy on Penn, because he saw that he was merely a sincere man who was making a great mistake.

Penn, Burnet afterwards tells us, persuaded a Scottish lawyer, Steward, to leave his Puritan and

Presbyterian party and become an ardent follower of King James. This Steward also came over to Holland to persuade William to agree that the tests should be abolished, and declared that James would never abolish the penal laws against dissenters' worship, unless the tests were abolished also; so that no sort of religious liberty could be had in England unless the test laws were sacrificed.

There is another incident connected with Penn's visit to the prince's court which should be mentioned, because it shows the strength of his relations with James II. He met there some prominent Presbyterian refugees from Scotland, and among them Sir Robert Stuart, of Coltness. On his return to England he recommended to James that these men should be allowed to return from exile because they were merely zealous for their religion, and had not been engaged in treasonable acts against the government. James complied, but Sir Robert Stuart, on his return, found himself penniless, because his estate had been given to the Earl of Arran. He told Penn of it; and in the Earl of Buchan's "Essays on Fletcher and Thompson," we have a description of the very sharp and quick way by which Penn compelled the restoration of the estate.

"Thou hast taken possession of Coltness's estate," said Penn. "Thou knowest that it is not thine."

"That estate," said Arran, "I paid a great price for. I received no other reward for my expensive and troublesome embassy in France."

"All very well, friend James, but of this assure thyself, that if thou dost not give me this moment an order on thy chamberlain for two hundred pounds to Coltness to carry him down to his native

country, and a hundred a year to subsist on till matters are adjusted, I will make it as many thousands out of thy way with the king" (p. 29).

Arran, we are told, instantly complied, and after the revolution the estate was fully restored. This strength of Penn's influence with the king leads us to infer that the king must have considered Penn's services of great value, and that Penn must have been doing a good deal for him. James II. was hardly the man to allow Penn so many favors for nothing.

It will be remembered, in the passage just quoted from Bishop Burnet, that he speaks of Penn as the friend of Lord Sunderland, or, as he puts it, "particularly trusted by the Earl of Sunderland." Penn had first met Sunderland in Paris, or, as some say, at Oxford, when the students rebelled against the surplices. They were always intimate. He assisted Penn in obtaining his charter for Pennsylvania. Penn wrote letters to him from the province. He addressed him in one letter as "Noble and old Friend," * and he sought his aid against Lord Baltimore. Penn's biographers usually mention this intimacy in a casual way, and I am inclined to think that the ordinary reader would infer that Sunderland was some pleasant, philanthropic nobleman, with a handsome country seat and plenty of game.

Unless, however, his biographers have very much belied him, this Sunderland was the most unprinci-

* Buck's Penn in America, p. 159; Memoirs, Penna. Hist. Soc., vol. iv. p. 183.

pled and low-lived politician that has ever been a curse to Great Britain. He had neither morals, honesty, nor honor. He was in the secret pay of France, and received from that source £2500 a year for furnishing information. He posed as the zealous friend of James II. ; but he allowed his wife to have an amorous intrigue with Henry Sydney, who was an adherent of the Prince of Orange, and through his wife and her paramour he sent information to that prince at the very time he professed to be upholding James. When he thought James was about to succeed in turning the government over to Rome, he became a Roman Catholic, having previously compelled his son to take the same course. When William III. arrived to drive James from the throne, Sunderland hastily absconded, having first robbed the jewel office and borrowed large sums of money. He afterwards returned to England, worked himself into the good graces of William, and became a Protestant again.

I do not give this description for the purpose of suggesting that it was wrong for Penn to be intimate with him, or that Penn was in any way like him. But if we would understand Penn's position and all that happened to him in the next few years, we must know his surroundings and the sort of men on whom he relied for favors and assistance.

Henry Sydney, who shared Sunderland's wife, was the brother of Algernon Sydney, and, strangely enough, his sister was Sunderland's mother. Henry Sydney soon took a leading part in bringing over William III. Penn was intimate with him, and, as

we shall see, was befriended by him; but he was not what we should call a saint.

There were very few saints at court. If Penn had declined to be intimate with any but good men, his acquaintance would have been small. These noblemen were all buying and selling one another. They would accuse one of their number of treason, give information against him, and immediately apply to have his estate given them when he should be convicted.

In the autumn of this year, 1686, after his return from Holland, we find Penn preaching in various parts of England, and delighted at the numbers which attended,—often a thousand at a meeting. At the same time he was writing most pathetic letters to the steward of his wilderness country-seat in Pennsylvania. They were still drawing on him for all sorts of things, the expenses of the government, and extravagant provisions and supplies for his servants and people at Pennsbury. "Now I desire thee," he writes, "to draw no more upon me for one penny." He was now, he says, £5000 and more behindhand. They have a good farm and stock at Pennsbury, why should they be importing meat and other things from Ireland and compelling him to pay for them? so again he says in the same letter, "I beseech thee not to draw any more."

He could easily have stopped this nonsense by a little firmness with his people, instead of beseeching and begging them; but he was a bad manager of such things. This man Harrison, who was his steward at Pennsbury, he liked and almost idolized,

as he did every one whom he employed. He wrote him most confidential, affectionate letters, which are very interesting now to read, because they show how he delighted in all his plans for the province.

He was sending out grape-vines by the thousand; for every one at that time expected that grapes and wine would be one of the great industries in America. While in the province, Penn had written to Lord Halifax about the "incredible number" of wild grapes, and he describes having drunk "a good claret" that had been made from them. It must have been his extreme delight in all these natural things of his province that made that claret seem good. Many years afterwards travellers related how everywhere in the environs of Philadelphia they saw grape-vines and the remains of attempted vineyards. Silk-worm raising was also another delusion which many people had about America; but Penn escaped that.

He was giving directions about gardening, grass, corn, and sheep, and the fertilizers soot and ashes that might be used. And how he longed to be back there again; and how quickly he would fly there if that detestable Baltimore litigation would only end! "There is nothing my soul breathes more for in this world, next to my dear family's life, than that I may see poor Pennsylvania again." But the people there must treat him better, or he would not come to them. They really must.

"Besides that the country think not upon my supply, and I resolve never to act the governor and keep another family and capacity upon my private estate. If my table, cellar and stable may be provided for, with a barge and yacht or sloop for the service of governor or

government I may try to get hence, for in the sight of God, I can say I am five thousand pounds behindhand more than I ever received or saw for land in that province, and to be so baffled by the merchants is discouraging and not to be put up."

The yacht seems at first sight an extravagance; but it was really needed for his journeys up and down his hundred miles of river-front, which was the principal highway. In another letter he scolds again. He really will not come to them unless they behave better and stop wrangling and misgoverning among themselves. He means what he says. "This is no anger, though I am grieved, but a cool and resolved thought." And then he goes on "entreating" them to stop drawing on him, instead of ordering them to stop; and he cannot understand why he should have to pay for sending beef to them from England.

When Penn's affections were deeply touched,—when he took a fancy to a province, or to a man, or to a king,—there seems to have been no limit to his folly.

XVIII

SUPPORTS THE DESPOTISM OF JAMES II

In the spring of 1687 James II. made what on its face was a grand proclamation of liberty. He issued a declaration of indulgence suspending not only the laws against the worship of Romanists and other dissenters, but also the test acts which kept them out of Parliament and civil and military offices. He threw down the bars and laid open the government in a way which he could certainly say was far in advance of his time; for such liberality was not afterwards attained in a hundred years.

Lawton, whose memoir has been already quoted, says that Penn had opposed an indulgence which suspended the laws in such an unconstitutional and unpopular way. We know not what passed between Penn and the king on the subject, and Lawton does not give us the source of his knowledge. But Penn's writings do not show an opposition to the Declaration of Indulgence; nor does his conduct. He was one of those who made efforts to procure from the various religious bodies addresses and memorials thanking the king for his declaration, and he himself presented the address from the Quakers describing the indulgence as well accepted throughout the country. We have the king's answer to this

latter address, and it is worth reading and remembering.

"Gentlemen, I thank you heartily for your address. Some of you know (I am sure you do Mr. Penn), that it was always my principle, that consciences ought not to be forced, and that all men ought to have the liberty of their consciences. And what I have promised in my declaration I will continue to perform so long as I live. And I hope before I die, to settle it, so that after ages shall have no reason to alter it."

This was the king's "word for liberty," in which Penn afterwards said he had implicit faith. He believed that the king would in the end establish complete liberty, and this was one of the reasons why he was willing to stand by him. The whole court had, indeed, put on the most extraordinary airs of liberality. The popish priests outdid Penn and described with enthusiasm the immense benefits that would result from religious liberty. But the king had peculiar methods for establishing this very desirable thing, and how Penn could continue to support him is a mystery which each reader must explain for himself as we go on.

Before he resorted to the Declaration of Indulgence James had been drawing Roman Catholics into office and into the livings of the Established Church. By dismissing some judges and packing the court with his favorites he had obtained a decision that although he might not have the right to dispense with the tests which prohibited Romanists as a body from holding office, he might on special grounds dispense with these tests in individual instances. In this way he thought that the offices of government might be

given to people of his own religion one by one. A start once made and the fashion set, many of the aristocracy would change their religion, as they had done in former reigns, and those who would not change could be forced. He supposed that English Churchmen were still very much attached to the doctrine of passive obedience and ready to accept without question the religion of the civil power if backed by force.

In this, however, he was mistaken. That the game had been successfully played before was true. In the early days of the Reformation when everything was in a state of flux, when men's minds were bewildered and their convictions unsteady, any one who captured the government machinery could force the religion of England into almost any channel he chose. But that day was passed, as James soon discovered, and Penn having failed to obtain for him the consent of William of Orange to a repeal of the tests which kept Roman Catholics out of power he resolved to repeal those tests on his own responsibility by the Declaration of Indulgence. To make it more acceptable he said that he would try to induce Parliament to abolish by law the tests which he was then abolishing by despotism.

Penn retained his confidence in James in the face of all facts and warnings. He knew the situation. He knew that the great object of the Roman church in that age was to seize political power, and that it was often successful; and he knew also the consequences of such success. He knew that Louis XIV. of France was on friendly terms with James, and

when opportunity offered would assist in capturing the English government for Rome. He had letters from friends on the continent describing the persecutions that still continued there : how the Protestants were hunted down by soldiers, who kept them awake by throwing water on them until they turned Catholic or went mad. He remembered that his uncle, George Penn, had been caught by the Inquisition in Spain, his property confiscated by the church, himself imprisoned for three years, during which time he was whipped once a month, and finally tortured on the rack and sent back to England a wrecked and dying man.

He must have felt the force of all this ; but he attempted to argue against it in a most extraordinary pamphlet called "Good Advice to Roman Catholic and Protestant Dissenters." This pamphlet was issued soon after the Declaration of Indulgence appeared, and was avowedly in support of the king's policy. It is significant that Penn would not sign his name to it, but published it anonymously.

The substance of it is that the test laws should be abolished in the interests of religious liberty, because there was now no danger from the Roman Catholics. They could not capture the government, even if the tests were removed, because, first of all, the masses of the English people were opposed to such an attempt. The Catholics were a sensible people, knew their own interest, and would not want to do what the majority in England disapproved of. "Toleration," he says, "and no more, is that which all Romanists ought to be satisfied with." And he professed to

think that because they ought to be satisfied that therefore they would be satisfied. They would not, he said, take too much. Some of them, undoubtedly, wanted to take everything, but they were not sufficiently numerous. In fact, the whole body of the Catholics was only a small fraction of the population,—scarcely thirty thousand out of eight million,—and they were very much divided in opinion.

As for the king's putting the Romanists in power, that was impossible, because he was an old man of fifty-three years, of a short-lived family, and he would not have time before his death to accomplish the designs of which he was suspected. Moreover, he had given his word against anything of that kind, and why should not a king's word be as good as any man's? Penn actually had the face to say that James would not establish popery and despotism because he had promised not to do so.

As for Louis XIV. of France coming to assist James in such a design, Penn said there was nothing to fear in that because it was not likely that James would be so ill advised as to admit a foreign army into England, and, even if he did, England had enough ships and men to prevent it.

This anonymous pamphlet is a rather ugly circumstance in Penn's life, and his biographers have touched very lightly upon it or attempted to obscure that part of it which advocates the abolition of the tests and upholds the policy of James. They would prefer to have it seem to be a pamphlet in favor only of the abolition of the penal laws against worship.

Some biographers not only ignore this pamphlet, but go so far as to argue that Penn was opposed to the policy of James. Dixon cites Clarendon as saying, under date of June 23, 1688, that Penn "labored to thwart the Jesuitical influence that predominated." But when we come to read this passage in Clarendon's diary, we find that Dixon has paraphrased it, and it is not quite so strong as he would have us believe.

"Robert Barclay dined with me: he told me that he and Penn had reconciled Lord Sunderland and Lord Melfort; which he hoped would be the ruin of Father Peters."

Very likely Penn did oppose the Jesuitical influence. He was, no doubt, as Dixon says, opposed to the Declaration of Indulgence being read in the churches; and, as we shall see, he advised the king to release the bishops who were imprisoned for not ordering it to be read. He also, it appears, advised the king "to be cautious in his connection with France, lest the country should be discontented." It will be observed, however, that he only advises him to be cautious. He does not advise him to abstain altogether. There is no doubt, however, that he remonstrated with the king against many of his measures, and we shall see more instances of his opposing particular measures. But he wrote the anonymous pamphlet favoring James's supreme measure of abolishing the tests, and he ridiculed the fears of what might result from this abolition. He was in the extraordinary position of opposing important measures of James's when they were first broached, and then, when they were carried out, acquiescing in them or,

as in the Declaration of Indulgence, assisting in carrying them out. He was opposed to particular measures; in fact, if we can believe his biographers, he was opposed to all the measures of James, and yet remained with him and secretly supported his most important measure in an anonymous pamphlet.

But it is absurd for any one to attempt to show that Penn was not an upholder of and believer in James; for Penn himself has expressly admitted it. He believed that James, in spite of his tyrannous measures, would come out right in the end. After James was dethroned by William III., Penn, in a letter to the Quakers explaining his conduct, said,—

"Nor can I yet see that providence of liberty and peace which we enjoyed under him was such a trick or snare as some have represented it. . . . One thing I know—could I have apprehended that the good days we had during his reign, were a trick to introduce evil ones, all obligations would have ceased with me and no man more earnestly and cheerfully engaged after my manner against his government than myself. (Janney's Life of Penn, p. 354.)

He was a very much deluded man; that was the simple truth of the matter; and, besides the anonymous pamphlet, he seems to have used his personal influence among the dissenters to reconcile them to the Declaration of Indulgence and the policy of the king. For this purpose the Dutch ambassador tells us he travelled over the kingdom.* But he could win over only a few. The great mass of them would not accept the measure, even though it contained a benefit for them; a benefit which was, indeed, great,

* Van Citters to States-General, 4/17 Oct. 1687; Mackintosh Revolution, 1688, p. 290.

for it relieved them from suffering which in this age we can hardly realize. They were shocked and alarmed at the principle involved,—that the king could without the consent of Parliament repeal laws ; and in the removal of the tests, which excluded both the Catholics and themselves from office, they saw nothing but the trick of a Catholic king to bring his own followers into power and crush out Protestantism by force.

But Penn went on believing in James. He still had faith in the royal word for liberty, and thought all fears to the contrary groundless. This expression, the king's word for liberty, had then become a party cry ; and there were many who maintained that the king's word on this subject was a better safeguard than law. But how Penn could continue to retain his faith in James or his word in the transaction with Magdalen College is difficult to understand.

James pursued his purpose steadily. He set out to capture the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and began to force Roman Catholic officers upon them. This was certainly attacking the stronghold, for whoever could possess himself of those two seats of learning could control the religion of England. Christ Church College and University were taken, and when the presidency of Magdalen became vacant he ordered the fellows to elect a Catholic. They refused, and when in spite of threats they continued to persist in their refusal, the king's officers broke down the college doors, turned out the president, the fellows, and the students, and the place was turned into a popish seminary.

In this piece of tyranny I am glad to say that

Penn at first took the part of remonstrating with the king. But unfortunately when he found the king set in his purpose he changed his ground and advised the college to yield. Two or three colleges would, he said, content the papists. Let them have Christ Church, University, and Magdalen. If they dared to go farther they would lose his support. This was his method for establishing religious liberty in England. He still professed to believe that James would not take everything for the Catholics; and he had no objection to the papists acquiring colleges by unlawful means. Colleges they must have, so he would let them take by violence one or two that belonged to the Protestants. His interview with the fellows of Magdalen is given by Dr. Hough, their president, and speaks for itself.

"He said 'Majesty did not love to be thwarted; and after so long a dispute we could not expect to be restored to the king's favor without making some concessions. . . .' However said I, 'Mr. Penn, in this I will be plain with you. We have our statutes and oaths to justify us in all that we have done hitherto; but setting this aside, we have a religion to defend, and I suppose yourself would think us knaves if we would tamely give it up. The papists have already gotten Christ Church and University: The present struggle is for Magdalen; and in a short time they threaten they will have the rest.' He replied with vehemence. 'That they shall never have, assure yourselves; if once they proceed so far they will quickly find themselves destitute of their present assistance. For my part, I have always declared my opinion that the preferments of the Church should not be put into any other hands but such as they are at present in; but I hope you would not have the two Universities such invincible bulwarks for the Church of England, that none but they must be capable of giving their children a learned education. I suppose two or three colleges will content the Papists; Christ Church is a noble structure, University is a pleasant place, and Magdalen College is a comely building. The walks are pleasant, and it is conveniently

situated, just at the entrance of the town,' &c., &c. When I heard him talk at this rate I concluded he was either off his guard, or had a mind to droll upon us. 'However,' I replied, 'when they had ours they would take the rest, as they and the present possessors could never agree! In short, I see it is resolved that the Papists must have our college; and I think all we have to do is, to let the world see that they take it from us, and that we do not give it up." (Janney's Life of Penn, 316.)

In all this conduct in support of James, Penn was in the most absurd manner contradicting his former principles. It will be remembered that at the time he was assisting in electing Algernon Sydney to Parliament, he wrote a pamphlet called "England's Great Interest in the Choice of this New Parliament," and he there declared that no law could be made or abrogated in England except by Parliament, that the English constitution was a government of laws, and that anything else was tyranny. Thus in 1679 he wrote directly against a declaration of indulgence, and in 1687 he was travelling about England trying to persuade the people to accept an indulgence.

Just after the failure of Algernon Sydney to be elected to Parliament, Penn wrote another pamphlet called "One Project for the Good of England," in which he spoke fiercely of the design of the papists to capture the government; declared that while nobody must be persecuted for their religion, yet England must be ruled by Protestants; that the difference between Catholics and Protestants was not only religious, but civil and political; that Catholics had a different theory of government; that they believed in despotism; and that if they got into power they would wreck the liberties of England.

His whole design, stated again and again in this pamphlet, was to band together the Church of England and the dissenters against the Romanists, to show that it was absurd for the Church of England to persecute the dissenters, because the dissenters could save the country from Roman despotism. Eight years later he had shifted to the opposite position and was trying to band together Rome and the dissenters against the Church of England.

The most curious part of all is, that at the end of this pamphlet he offers a new test oath, composed by himself, drawn with great care, so that Quakers could take it, and followed by provisions for having it subscribed by all the freeholders of England, for the express purpose of keeping every Roman Catholic in the kingdom out of politics and out of power. In 1679, therefore, he was advocating tests and inventing some of his own. In 1687 he was for abolishing the tests altogether.

James went on step by step, and doubtless Penn thought that each step would be the last, and would satisfy the papists. But the papists became so abundantly satisfied that the Protestants could stand it no longer. James being determined to have laws made in support of his policy, attempted to pack Parliament, or, in the language then used, regulate it. He attempted to regulate the counties, the boroughs, and the returning officers, so that his own favorites would be elected, and as fast as one violent scheme of this sort failed he tried another. When he found himself still unsuccessful in getting the members he wanted he called on the boroughs

to surrender their charters and receive new ones. Few complied, and those that refused had soldiers quartered on them to harass them into a surrender. Through all the departments of government there was a general turning out to make vacancies to be filled by the king's men.

In this way a year passed by after the Declaration of Indulgence had been issued, and in April, 1688, James issued another of those dangerous instruments to the same effect as the first one. But he made it more detestable by announcing that he would put none into public office except those who would support him in maintaining the indulgence, and he completed his own ruin by ordering that this second indulgence should be read on two successive Sundays by the clergy in all the churches of the kingdom. He intended to humiliate and break down the Church of England and bend it to his will. He would compel its clergy to read the intrument intended for their ruin, the instrument which would allow papists to replace them in their livings and parishes. As his Jesuit adviser, Father Petre, expressed it, the English clergy must eat dirt, the dirtiest of all dirt.

But again James had miscalculated. The dissenters had no love for the Established Church ; but as Englishmen and lovers of liberty they encouraged the Churchmen to resist this act of tyranny. The Declaration was read in but few churches, and in some of those the people all left as soon as they heard the first words of it. Seven bishops had petitioned the king against the order requiring the

Declaration to be read, and James in his folly had the seven tried for a seditious libel, and even went so far as to imprison them in the Tower pending the trial because they refused to give bail. But it is hardly necessary to describe in detail this famous episode in English history, the outburst of indignation it caused, and the way in which it united the whole nation against the king, who was now believed to be another Bloody Mary.

At the same time another event occurred which sealed his fate. The queen gave birth to a son, and the people, seeing before them at least another generation of papal despotism, were ready for revolution. Russell and Henry Sydney formed the plan of bringing over William, the Protestant Prince of Orange, who had married James's daughter. He landed in England that same year and took the throne almost without opposition. James, deserted by his army, navy, and court, threw the Great Seal into the Thames and fled to France, where he lived the rest of his days, a pensioner on the bounty of Louis XIV.

We are informed in the memoir of Charlewood Lawton, already quoted, that Penn opposed the regulation of the boroughs, and the depriving them of their charters, so that they would return the king's men to Parliament. Very likely he did. We should be sorry to think that with his principles he failed to oppose such an outrageous piece of tyranny. But he opposed it in a peculiar way, and Lawton's description shows that Penn opposed in this case as he did in the seizure of Magdalen College,—first op-

posing, and then consenting when he saw opposition was in vain.

Penn would get Lawton to write him letters opposing unpopular measures, and these letters, being unsigned, Penn would show to the king, apparently for the purpose of dissuading the king from his purpose. He also took Lawton to see the king, and the king listened to Lawton's arguments. Lawton says he is convinced that Penn had no hand in setting on foot the measure for forcing the boroughs, and no doubt this is true. But after Lawton had been to the king, and expressed his mind very bluntly, Penn came to him with a message that the king was pleased with his sincerity, and wished to give him a place. "The king," Penn is reported to have said, "hath a mind thou shouldst be in commission of the peace and a member of the next Parliament, and a corporation will be found where some honest gentleman will bring thee in."

This was nothing more nor less than an attempt on the part of the king to buy up Lawton's opposition, and make him a member of his regulated Parliament, which was to do his bidding; and Penn was assisting in it and carrying the message. Lawton rejected the offer with indignation. "As to being a member of Parliament, I told him I should be glad if a regulated Parliament did any good, but by the help of God I would never make one amongst them."

Lawton's memoir praises Penn, and at the same time reveals his rather unpraiseworthy political conduct. Apparently what Lawton means is that Penn's intentions were honest in spite of his conduct.

Lawton ridiculed the Declaration of Indulgence, and expected that Penn would not like him for it, which shows very clearly what Penn's position was in regard to that instrument. But Penn did not change his feeling towards him; pressed him again to take an office under James; and in describing this Lawton shows that Penn was quite intimate with the infamous Jeffreys.

"But all that Mr. Penn replied upon hearing both was that I was an honest man, but would go my own way; and instead of growing colder, offered me, the very next time he came down into the country, to bring my Lord Chancellor Jefferies, who did not (tho' he went himself too much in with the court) mislike a man for being stiff for the Church of England, to junket, as Mr. Penn called it, one evening; and Mr. Penn again pressed me to come into Parliament, and the commission of the peace; I declined both." (Memoirs, Penna. Hist. Soc., vol. iii. part ii. p. 230.)

Penn and Jeffreys were evidently working hard to gather in Lawton to the side of King James. As to Lawton and Penn associating in a friendly manner with such a man as Jeffreys, that would not have been much thought of then, because cruelty and notorious oppression and corruption by a judge were not so shocking as they have since become. Jeffreys's reputation has grown worse with time. The people of his day thought him a very wrong-headed man; but they would probably read with surprise the modern frantic denunciations of him.

As to the imprisonment of the seven bishops, Lawton assures us that Penn was from the first opposed to their commitment, and on the day when the king's son was born he went to the king "and pressed him exceedingly to set them at liberty," as an act

which would be so popular with the people that their good-will towards the king might be restored. But James had for advisers the Jesuits, who were determined through him to establish the papacy in England. They failed, as their methods in the long run have usually failed, and they ruined James. Was it not, however, entirely natural that Penn should be thought to be one of them. His protests against the measures of the king were in secret and known only to a few of his friends. Before the public and the world he stood as at best the mediator who was trying to make the king's measures palatable to the people; and most people very naturally inferred that he inspired and approved of those measures.

They soon discovered that James had sent him to the Prince of Orange to persuade that prince to agree that the tests that kept the papists out of office should be removed, and they discovered also that he was the author of the anonymous pamphlet already mentioned, "Good Advice to the Church of England," in which he advocated the removal of the tests and laughed at the fears of papal supremacy as childish. Thousands of people in England were then as thoroughly convinced that Penn was a Jesuit in disguise as we are now to the contrary. He had taken orders, they said, in Rome, where he had been granted a dispensation to marry, and he had since then frequently officiated as a priest in the celebration of the mass at Whitehall, St. James's, and other places in England. If we had lived then, we should probably have had the same opinion they held; for the Jesuits at that time were not the com-

paratively insignificant and harmless body they have since become.

They pervaded the political and social life of all Europe. Their methods and purposes were then rapidly reaching that enormity for which they were afterwards expelled from every country of Europe, and for a time from the Roman church itself. They adopted every imaginable form of disguise. Some became Baptist or Puritan preachers, some were gay, swearing cavaliers ; some became domestic servants. They were the most learned, astute, untiring, and unscrupulous of men. Their disguises were so perfect and in many cases so dramatic that the people had grown accustomed to look for them in the most unexpected forms and places. It would be just like one of them to take the rôle of the most strenuous advocate of religious liberty in England, to be the sort of man in every way that Penn was, and in that guise, along with private intimacy with the king, secure the abolition of the tests and let all his brother Jesuits into power.

In the autumn of 1688, a few weeks before the Prince of Orange landed at Torbay to drive James from the throne, these suspicions against Penn became so wide-spread that some of his friends tried to save him from them by giving him a chance to contradict them in writing and explain his relations with the king. William Popple, secretary of the Privy Council's Committee on Trade and Plantations, wrote him a long, formal, but beautiful letter, asking him, in the gentlest and most friendly manner, if he was aware of the condition in which he stood.

The consciousness of innocence, Popple said, was giving him too great a contempt for slanders. It was possible to be too serene and sublime. An unswerving prosecution of an honest purpose was well, but at the same time a man should guard his reputation. He was deep in intimacy with a king who was believed by the whole kingdom to be establishing popery by force as the national religion. He had so great a part in the councils of that king that it was difficult for people to suppose he was anything but an absolute papist. "Your post is too considerable," said Popple, "for a papist of an ordinary form, and therefore you must be a Jesuit."

He was offering a most melancholy prospect to his friends, for he was giving his enemies the opportunity they desired of destroying him. The aspersion of Jesuitism that had been cast upon him was offsetting the benefit of all his efforts in the great cause of liberty of conscience, the cause to which he had devoted his life.

"It has weakened the force of your endeavors, obstructed their effect, and contributed greatly to disappoint this poor nation of that inestimable happiness, and secure establishment, which I am persuaded you designed, and which all good and wise men agree, that a just and inviolable liberty of conscience would infallibly produce. I heartily wish this consideration had been sooner laid to heart and that some demonstrative evidence of your sincerity in the profession you make had accompanied all your endeavors for liberty."

In his reply to this letter Penn laid aside the set phraseology of his sect, and wrote in that plain but soft and pleasant English he could at times command. He denied, of course, in the fullest and most

detailed manner, that he was a papist or a Jesuit, and he denied each one of the particular instances of Jesuitism brought against him: his officiating as a priest, his dispensation to marry, or his having kidnapped one formerly a monk out of Pennsylvania to deliver him over to his enemies in England.

"The only reason that I can apprehend, they have to repute me a Roman Catholic, is my frequent going to Whitehall, a place no more forbid to me than to the rest of the world, who yet, it seems, find much fairer quarter. I have almost continually had one business or other there for our Friends, whom I ever served with a steady solicitation through all times since I was of their communion. I had also a great many personal good offices to do, upon a principle of charity, for people of all persuasions; thinking it a duty to improve the little interest I had for the good of those that needed it, especially the poor. I must add something of my own affairs, too, though I must own, if I may without vanity, that they have ever had the least share of my thoughts or pains, or else they would not have still depended as they yet do."

Then he goes on to tell why he likes King James and believes in him. Cannot, he asks, "a Protestant dissenter be dutiful, thankful, and serviceable to the king though he be of the Roman Catholic communion. We hold not our property or protection from him by our persuasion, and therefore his persuasion should not be the measure of our allegiance." This was a most extraordinary sentence to write in view of recent events. The king's persuasion was leading him to violate property in the most outrageous manner. He was taking the colleges of the Church of England away from their lawful owners to give them to papists. He was compelling towns to surrender their charters so that he might turn them

over to papist officials. He was packing Parliament by bribery and corruption that it might turn over to papists the livings, church buildings, and other property of the Church of England. Religious persuasion was becoming very closely connected with property rights and allegiance.

But Penn goes on.

"I am sorry to see so many, that seem fond of the reformed religion by their disaffection to him [the king] recommend it so ill. Whatever practices of Roman Catholics we might reasonably object against, and no doubt but such there are, yet he has disclaimed and reprehended those ill things by his declared opinion against persecution, by the ease in which he actually indulges all dissenters, and by the confirmation he offers in Parliament for the security of the Protestant religion and liberty of conscience. And in his honor, as well as in my own defence, I am obliged in conscience to say, that he has ever declared to me it was his opinion; and on all occasions, when Duke, he never refused me the repeated proofs of it, as often as I had any poor sufferers for conscience' sake to solicit his help for."

This was certainly a strange statement for Penn to make. It meant that he took the king's word for everything and shut his eyes to the facts; took his word that he was not forcing popery on colleges, Parliament, government, and Church of England; calmly looked at him doing it, and said he could not see it. It meant also that for the sake of securing present relief to the Quakers and some other dissenters, he was willing that the king should establish popery in the Church of England and in the government.

In another passage he argues with rather too much subtlety against the opinion that he was supporting the measures of James.

"Is anything more foolish as well as false, than that because I am often at Whitehall, therefore I must be the author of all that is done there that does not please abroad? But supposing some such things to have been done, pray tell me, if I am bound to oppose anything that I am not called to do. I never was a member of council, cabinet, or committee, where the affairs of the kingdom are transacted. I have had no office or trust, and consequently nothing can be said to be done by me. . . . However, one thing I know, that I have everywhere most religiously observed, and endeavored in conversation with persons of all ranks and opinions, to allay heats, and moderate extremes, even in the politics."

All this sounds very pretty and innocent. But if he was so entirely free from responsibility, and taking no part whatever in the affairs of James, why did he publish anonymously that pamphlet, "Good Advice to the Church of England," advocating the abolition of the tests, and ridiculing the notion that James would force popery on the government? Why did he advise the fellows of Magdalen to give up their college to James, on the ground that two or three colleges would satisfy the papists? Why was he bringing Charlewood Lawton to the king to have him argue against the king's measures? Why was he procuring Lawton to write letters to be read to the king? and why at the king's request did he ask Lawton to accept an office which would compel Lawton to change his opinions.

According to the diary of Narcissus Luttrell, Penn himself had been appointed to an office before Popple's letter was written. Under date of August 8, 1688,* Luttrell says, "Mr. Penn the Quaker is to be superintendent of the revenues of excise and hearth

* Vol. i. p. 453.

money," and September 17,* "Mr. Penn is made supervisor of the excise and hearth money." Penn, however, in his letter to Popple says, "I have had no office or trust."

But hear his final excuse, which I think shows the real cause of his infatuation.

"To this let me add the relation my father had to this king's service, his particular favor in getting me released out of the Tower of London in 1669, my father's humble request to him upon his death bed to protect me from the inconveniences and troubles my persuasion might expose me to, and his friendly promise to do it and exact performance of it from the moment I addressed myself to him; I say when all this is considered, anybody, that has the least pretence to good nature, gratitude, or generosity, must needs know how to interpret my access to the king."

I know of no other explanation than the above that will fully account for Penn's blind determination to stand by the king no matter what he did. If a man was once his friend, he never could let him go. Even men, like some of those he appointed deputy governors of Pennsylvania, to whom he owed no gratitude, could not forfeit his friendship even when they were wrecking his property and interests. He would cling to them in spite of everything, dismiss them at last only when compelled to it, and do so with the greatest regret. But in the case of those to whom he felt bound by gratitude, and such life-long gratitude as bound him to King James, it was simply impossible and out of the question for him to see any fault in them. His sense of gratitude and affection in such cases was a more consuming passion than his devotion to religious liberty.

* vol. i. p. 461.

XIX

SUSPICIONS, CONSPIRACIES, AND HIDING

THE five years following that autumn of 1688, when James II. fled to France, were a sad time for Penn; but his biographers, in their account of this period, have not dealt honestly with their readers. In the hope of exalting their hero they have obscured and confused the evidence and omitted parts of it, as they pleased. This method, however, is apt to be more of an injury than an advantage, for when the truth comes out it seems disgraceful from the attempt at concealment. For my own part, I cannot see that there was anything to conceal, and I think Penn's reputation has been seriously injured by the disingenuous way in which this part of his life has been treated.

Penn did not believe in William III. or in the revolution of 1688, which brought him to the throne. His whole course of conduct proves this most clearly, and I cannot see the slightest use in attempting to deny or conceal his position. He believed, on the contrary, in James II., whom he personally liked, whom he supported to the last, and whom he would have been glad to have had come back and displace King William. He always insisted on believing that there would be more toleration and liberty under

James than under William. There is no doubt that this was his opinion. But it was merely a political opinion, and there is no necessity for assuming, as his biographers do, that it was an infamous crime which must be kept in the background. It was not a crime at all. It was merely a mistake, a political mistake, from our point of view. There were many who thought it not even a mistake.

Penn has not told us what he thought and felt when his royal friend and benefactor, the friend of his father, fled the country. That flight left him in a very awkward situation. There were several courses he could pursue. He could follow his royal friend to France, make one of his court there, at the palace Louis XIV. gave him to live in, and assist him in making war on England to win back his crown. But that would not have been Quaker-like ; it would have been inconsistent with Penn's life-long position as protector and representative of his sect in England ; and what would have become of Pennsylvania, forfeited to the crown for the treason of its proprietor. It was necessary, it would seem, for him to stay at home ; and if he stayed at home, what should he do?

Most of those who had been friends of James, and had decided to stay at home, went quickly to William and made their peace with him, promised to serve him, to be his friend and James's enemy, and they were given places in his household and government. Macaulay and other writers have given us amusing descriptions of the sudden way in which these distinguished men changed their affections and

opinions and fell on their knees before the new monarch. But Penn was not one of them. He was incapable of that sort of thing.

He had never liked William ; and he did not believe that he would establish religious liberty. In his pamphlet, "A Persuasive to Moderation," written in the beginning of the reign of James, Penn speaks of the growing power of William as "an ebb to the strength" of Holland. He was evidently one of those who thought William was a mere self-seeker, so infatuated with the pursuit of glory that he would be an injury to both Holland and England. Penn liked him no better when he marched into London over the fallen hopes and fortunes of his friend James. To say that he did not rush to him with the others and tell him a pack of sycophantic lies may seem like small praise, but in that age of rebellions and revolutions, when public men were constantly shifting their ground, it is more to Penn's credit than we might at first suppose.

Penn could have stayed at home as some did and plot for the restoration of James. But that was a dangerous game. It would also have been inconsistent with Quaker principles and inconsistent with Penn's long announced position, that he was a mediator and not an active participant in politics, one whose mission was to soften the violence of rebels and of partisans in the interest of peace.

There was, therefore, only one course left that he could take, and that was to stay at home, follow his usual avocations so far as possible, neither toady to William nor plot to restore James, and at the same

WILLIAM III

time admit that James was still his friend, and that he did not believe in the revolution which had deprived him of the crown. This was a difficult position to maintain, because ordinary minds would not believe in its sincerity. They would insist that he must be plotting; that it was impossible for him to stay at home and be the friend of James and not plot for his return. Nevertheless, this difficult course is, I think, the one Penn laid out for himself, and the reader must form his own opinion as to how closely he lived up to it.

On the 10th of December, 1688, soon after William III. entered London, Penn was arrested while walking, it is said, in Whitehall, the place where he had carried on his courtier occupations under James, and where he was probably now trying to attend to some of the remains of that business. He was taken immediately before the Privy Council, which was then sitting, and in answer to questions he is reported to have said,—

"He had done nothing but what he could answer before God and all the princes in the world; that he loved his country and the Protestant religion above his life, and had never acted against either; that all he had ever aimed at in his public endeavors was no other than what the prince himself had declared for [religious liberty]; that King James had always been his friend, and his father's friend; and that in gratitude he himself was the king's, and did ever, as much as in him lay, influence him to his true interest."

This statement seems to have satisfied the king. It will be observed that there is not a word of flattery or even compliment to William, or a promise of allegiance to him. He was the sort of king,

however, who could appreciate such straightforwardness in a subject. But Penn was at that time under a terrible cloud of suspicion. All England was screaming Jesuit and papist at him. It would be unwise to assume at once that he would be a safe man, and declare him innocent in the face of the popular clamor against him. So he was compelled to give security for his appearance the first day of the next term. When he appeared at the appointed time, his case was continued to Easter term, and then, no witnesses appearing against him, he was discharged.

Soon afterwards, in the year 1688, the Parliament passed the famous Toleration Act which William had promised when he announced that he had come to drive James from the throne. This act established religious liberty by law. All dissenters except Roman Catholics and Unitarians were given the right to worship as they pleased; but they must take out licenses for their meeting-houses or chapels, take the oath of allegiance, and not worship behind closed doors, a precaution considered necessary at that time to prevent plots against the government. The Quakers were allowed to affirm instead of taking an oath. But the test oaths which kept the Roman Catholics and all other dissenters from holding office were retained as a safeguard, proved by terrible experience to be necessary in that age.

That was the end of religious persecution in England. From that date to this the British people have enjoyed the fullest liberty in worship, and the

tests which kept the Roman Catholics and other dissenters out of office have been slowly relaxed as the desire of the Roman church for seizing political power became less earnest and its ability to attain that end was weakened.

So the great object of Penn's life was accomplished, and by whom? Not by his life-long friend James, from whom apparently he expected it, but by James's implacable enemy, William, the Dutchman. What Penn had been trying to accomplish through despotic declarations of indulgence, and what he believed would never be accomplished in any other way was now suddenly accomplished for all time by an honest law passed by Parliament without any attempt at despotism.

Penn's biographers at this point usually introduce a few conventional sentences to the effect that this great constitutional change must have been highly gratifying to one who had labored so long to that end, and so on. Clarkson goes so far as to assert that Penn was really the author of the Toleration Act, and had convinced William of the necessity of it. This is, of course, ridiculous, for William got his notions of liberty without any aid from Penn.

Dixon says that Penn was very much pleased with the results of the Toleration Act. But this is again mere assumption, for Penn was entirely silent on the subject. There is not a word of his that can be quoted for or against it. It may be that he thought it well enough so far as it went, but laboring under the delusion that James and the Jesuits would have been contented with a few colleges and a few offices, he

would have preferred that the tests be repealed, and a freedom in office-holding allowed, which has scarcely yet been attained in England. Or, more likely, he was so firm in his affection and friendship for James that he could not be enthusiastic about this great boon of liberty because it came from James's detestable enemy.

Besides the Toleration Act, Parliament passed a few months later what has ever since been known as the Bill of Rights, a famous document, which, after describing all the sins of James's despotism, proceeds to abolish and make them odious. No king shall ever again suspend or dispense with a law on any pretext, or prosecute a citizen or bishop for petitioning, or create by his own authority an ecclesiastical court, or levy taxes, or keep a standing army without the consent of Parliament, or pack juries, or Parliaments. Freedom of speech in Parliament must never again be interfered with ; nor shall any future king disarm Protestants while allowing papists to retain their arms, nor grant away to his favorites the fines and forfeitures of persons accused of crimes ; nor shall there be any more excessive bail or fines, or cruel and illegal punishments. That these things may be the more secure, frequent Parliaments shall be held ; and that they may be doubly secure, the British crown shall never again descend to a person who is not a Protestant.

This document was really a sort of British Declaration of Independence, and modern England has grown up under it. The reforms which it established were the very ones for which Penn in his younger

days had ardently contended ; and it is a sad reflection that he was now so infatuated with Jacobitism that he could scarcely appreciate them.

During the remainder of the year 1689 and until the spring of 1690 he was undisturbed by the government, and during that time he was probably living in the country at Worminghurst. But during this period there is some evidence of an expression of opinion on his part which Macaulay considers as evidence that he was plotting to restore James and doing "everything in his power to bring a foreign army into the heart of his own country." The only evidence Macaulay has is a letter written by Avaux, the French ambassador, to Louis XIV., June 5, 1689, in which Avaux says that he encloses some notes of news from England and Scotland, and then adds that the beginning of his news from England is taken from a letter written by Penn, the original of which he has seen. In the notes enclosed the news relating to England taken from Penn's letter is merely to the effect that the Prince of Orange begins to be disgusted with the English, and the aspect of affairs is changing rapidly, as is the way with these islanders, and that the prince's health is bad.

Macaulay assumes that Penn sent this letter to James. But there is no evidence that he did. Avaux does not say so. The letter may have been written to anybody, and what it says was well known,—namely, that William's health was bad, that the people were not so enthusiastic for him as they had been, and that he was becoming disgusted with them. Penn, or anybody, William's best friend or

William himself, might have written such statements. There is not the slightest evidence of a plot in them.

In the spring of 1690, however, the government intercepted a letter from James, asking Penn "to come to his assistance in the present state and condition he was in, and express the resentments of his favor and benevolence." This was very serious, and Penn was ordered to appear before the Privy Council. Our authority for what happened on that occasion is Gerard Croese's "General History of the Quakers," published in 1696.

"Upon this, Penn being cited to appear, was asked why King James wrote unto him, he answered he could not hinder such a thing. Being further questioned what resentments these were which the late king seemed to desire of him, he answered he knew not, but said he supposed King James would have him to endeavor his restitution, and that though he could not decline the suspicion, yet he could avoid the guilt, and since he had loved King James in his prosperity he should not hate him in his adversity, yea he loved him as yet for many favors he had conferred on him, though he would not join with him in what concerned the state of the kingdom. He owned he had been much obliged to King James, and that he would reward his kindness by any private office as far as he could, observing inviolably and entirely that duty to the public and government which was equally incumbent upon all subjects, and therefore that he had never the vanity to think of endeavoring to restore him that crown which was fallen from his head, so that nothing in that letter could at all seem to fix guilt upon him." (Croese, p. 113.)

This was certainly a very frank and honest statement, and it describes the very wise position of friendly neutrality between William and James which Penn intended to maintain. The letter James wrote was not by itself conclusive evidence of plotting on

the part of Penn, for, as he said, he could not prevent the banished king from writing to him.

In the biography by Besse prefixed to Penn's Works, we are told that when first brought before the council on this occasion, Penn asked to be heard in the presence of the king, and this request was granted. The examination lasted, it is said, two hours; and a great deal must have been said in that time; but Besse gives no report of it, nor does he mention or refer in any way to the report which we have quoted as given by Croese. Possibly Penn may have told some one the substance of his answers to the king and council, and Croese may have heard it at second or third hand. Besse goes on to say that after the two hours' examination William was inclined to acquit Penn entirely, but to please some of the council he was held upon bail for a while, and in Trinity term of the same year discharged.

Croese is not the best sort of authority; but as he and Besse were contemporaries of Penn, I am entirely willing to accept what they say. But there I draw the line. Clarkson, who wrote in 1814, says that Penn was arrested on that occasion "by a body of military;" but Croese says only that he was cited to appear, and Besse that he was brought before the council. In Dixon's biography, written in 1856, Clarkson's body of military becomes a band of military which "one day beset his house and placed him under arrest;" and instead of quoting what Croese says of the examination, which is all we know of it, Dixon paraphrases it into a very dra-

matic conversation, stating at one point, "The Lords were startled at this frank interpretation;" and again, "William was struck with a defence so unusual." There would be no harm in Dixon using his imagination, if he would warn the reader of it; but he states his suppositions and guesses as if they were facts of the examination; and this is not the only episode of Penn's life which has been developed in this way.

In the summer of this year, 1690, James invaded Ireland with an army, and William went there to meet him. The French admiral, having beaten the combined Dutch and English fleets, was hovering off the coast. Queen Mary was left alone in London to govern as best she could; and as the plots for the overthrow of herself and her husband thickened, Penn was suspected, along with Lord Clarendon, Lord Preston, and about fifteen others. He was arrested by proclamation, July 18, 1690, and remained many months in prison until tried at the close of the year. Several of those arrested with him were convicted, and one of them was executed, but he himself was acquitted. Lord Preston, who turned state's evidence, seems to have had nothing against him except conversations, in which Penn had mentioned long lists of persons who were friendly to King James. Such statements, of course, amounted to nothing.

Penn, being friendly to James, and disliking William, often, I have no doubt, spoke of those who favored James's return. He would not, as I have already said, assist actively in accomplishing that return; but from all his previous conduct and words

I think we can say he would have been glad to see it accomplished. He naturally often spoke favorably of James, and spies and informers might easily construe his words as evidence of a plot.

It had now become evident that William, in becoming king, had other purposes to accomplish besides delivering England from a tyrant. He intended to use England in an alliance with the Protestant powers to crush France. The war was already beginning, and the English people foresaw the expenses of a great army with increased taxation. This alienated not a few friends of William, who had assisted in bringing him to the throne. We would naturally suppose that it would alienate Penn more than ever, and he would naturally be brought into association with those who, like himself, were friendly to James. He could not very well avoid talking to them; some of them might be plotting for his old friend's return; and from his association with such people it is not surprising that the government often suspected him.

But for a short time after his trial, at the close of 1690, the government seems to have been satisfied that he was altogether innocent of plotting, for almost immediately after the trial the secretary of state granted him an order for a convoy to take him to Pennsylvania. He published proposals for settlers, a number of whom he intended to take with him, and he was soon to depart. But George Fox died on the 13th of January, and on the 16th Penn preached at his funeral. Soon after the ceremony he learned that a warrant had been issued for him,

and that the officers intended to take him at the funeral, but, mistaking the hour, came too late.

What the evidence was on this occasion we do not know, for Penn did not give the officers another chance to take him. He went into hiding, an act which some of his biographers have attempted to obscure by calling it "retirement," "living in seclusion," or "taking private lodgings." But it is better to state the fact and truth. No one now knows where he went. Clarkson, however, informs us without hesitation that he took "a private lodging in London;" and all the biographers seem to be agreed that during the three years he remained in concealment he was in London all the time. Stoughton describes the London of that day with its queer secluded courts and alleys with rambling, overhanging houses, where, he says, Penn could have been as effectually concealed as in a wilderness.

But this is mere picturesque guessing. In a letter written towards the close of his concealment, Penn says, "I have been above these three years hunted up and down, and could never be allowed to live quietly in city or country." Narcissus Luttrell, in his diary, says that at one time during his concealment, Penn went to France. So it would seem that he was constantly on the move, and did not remain all the time in London. There is no doubt, however, that he was at times in London; and he seems to have had some special place of concealment there; for after the king withdrew his suspicions, and concealment was no longer necessary, he says that he preached in London and then

went "to visit the sanctuary of my solitude." He adds, "and after that to see my poor wife and children; the eldest being with me all this while."

Exactly why Penn hid himself during those three years we shall never know. Besse, in the life of him already often referred to, says that the warrant had been issued on information furnished by the notorious Fuller, who made a business, like Titus Oates, of accusing prominent people. In the absence of a modern detective system the government was compelled to rely on these irregular informers. Fuller was not long afterwards declared, by Parliament, to be a cheat and impostor, and punished. Besse's statement has been accepted by all subsequent biographers and they argue that Penn was unwilling to take the chances of a trial on evidence furnished by this wretch, and so resolved to escape arrest altogether.

Fuller was, however, not then known to be so infamous as he was afterwards proved. Macaulay points out that, according to his own life of himself, he was not at that time in England, and he also cites a letter written by Caermarthen to King William, February 3, saying that the only witness against Penn was Preston. Penn nowhere says that this warrant was based on Fuller's information. He says that he was indicted in Ireland on information furnished by Fuller and some others; but that was another matter. It should also be observed that Fuller was discredited a few months after this warrant for Penn was issued; but Penn remained in hiding for three years. There was evidently some reason for

this concealment which is not now apparent, and Fuller seems to have had little or nothing to do with it.

Nothing that Penn has left in writing throws much light upon it; for he refers to his concealment only in general terms, an unfortunate practice which he and the Quakers indulged in too much on many occasions. He had, of course, to give up his voyage to Pennsylvania, and, writing of it to the province, he says,—

"By this time thou wilt have heard of the renewal of my troubles, the only hinderance of my return, being in the midst of my preparations with a great company of adventurers when they came upon me. The jealousies of some and unworthy dealings of others, have made way for them; but under and over it all the ancient Rock has been my shelter and comfort; and I hope yet to see your faces with our ancient satisfaction." (Janney, 359.)

In a letter written May 30, 1691, to the Yearly Meeting of Quakers in London, he says,—

"My privacy is not because men have sworn truly, but falsely against me; 'for wicked men have laid in wait for me and false witnesses have laid to my charge things that I knew not.'" (Janney, 356.)

This last quotation would include an accusation like Fuller's; and yet if Fuller had been the cause he would probably have named him as he did in speaking of the indictment in Ireland. In the first quotation it will be observed he refers his troubles to "The jealousies of some and unworthy dealings of others." Judging from all the evidence, which we shall have more in detail later, it seems to me

that the government had information about him, not merely from Fuller, but from other sources which made them very suspicious of him. Their suspicion was not strong enough to make them hot in his pursuit. It was William's policy to be very easy and generous with his enemies unless they became decidedly dangerous. The government did not consider it essential to the safety of the throne to seize and try Penn at once. They were willing he should hide, and meantime they could await developments.

Soon after Penn's concealment a plot was discovered to bring over King James in the absence of William, who had gone to The Hague to attend a conference of princes. It was thought that with William out of the country, only a small army left, and the people discontented with the four millions of taxes William's government had imposed, it would be only necessary for James to arrive suddenly with a very small force to have the whole nation flock to him and achieve a complete revolution in his favor. "The men who laid this design," says Burnet, "were the Earl of Clarendon, the Bishop of Ely, the Lord Preston, and his brother Mr. Graham, and Pen, the famous Quaker."

There is no doubt that the first four were guilty. Preston was caught red-handed with the papers in his possession. He saved his life by turning state's evidence, and named Penn, among others, as one of those in the plot. The papers found on him were also believed by the government to implicate Penn, and he was included in the proclamation for the arrest of all these conspirators.

Penn may have had some remote and indefinite connection with the plan; but he was never proved to have been guilty. It would be impossible, however, to have convinced Burnet and other adherents of William, including Lord Macaulay, that Penn was not as guilty as the others. Burnet adds to his account of the plot, "The Bishop of Ely, Grimes, and Pen absconded."

Penn from his hiding-place sent his brother-in-law to Henry Sydney, brother of his old deceased friend, Algernon Sydney. Henry Sydney, who was about this time made Lord Romney, had been very instrumental in bringing over William, and now stood high in his government. He describes his interview with Penn in a letter to King William of February 27, 169⅘.

"About ten days ago, Mr. Penn sent his brother-in-law, Mr. Lowther, to me to let me know that he would be very glad to see me, if I would give him leave, and promise to let him return without being molested; I sent him word I would, if the queen would permit it; he then desired me not to mention it to anybody but the queen; I said I would not: A Monday he sent to me to know what time I would appoint; I named Wednesday in the evening, and accordingly I went to the place at the time, where I found him just as he used to be, not at all disguised, but in the same clothes and the same humour I formerly have seen him in: it would be too long for your Majesty to read a full account of our discourse, but in short it was this, that he was a true and faithful servant of King William and Queen Mary, and if he knew anything that was prejudicial to them or their government he would readily discover it: he protested in the presence of God that he knew of no plot, nor did he believe there was any one in Europe, but what King Lewis hath laid, and he was of opinion that King James knew the bottom of this plot as little as other people: he saith, he knows your Majesty hath a great many enemies; and some that came over with you, and some that joined you soon after your arrival, he was sure were more inveterato

against you, and more dangerous than the Jacobites, for he saith that there is not one man amongst them that hath common understanding. To the letters that were found with my Lord Preston, and the paper of the conference, he would not give any positive answer, but said if he could have the honor to see the king, and that he would be pleased to believe the sincerity of what he saith, and pardon the ingenuity of what he confessed, he would freely tell everything he knew of himself, and other things that would be much for his Majesty's service and interest to know, but if he cannot obtain this favour he must be obliged to quit the kingdom; which he is very unwilling to do. He saith he might have gone away twenty times if he had pleased, but he is so confident of giving your Majesty satisfaction if you would hear him, that he was resolved to expect your return before he took any sort of measures. What he intends to do, is all he can do for your service, for he can't be a witness if he would, it being, as he saith, against his conscience and his principles to take an oath. This is the sum of our conference, and I am sure your Majesty will judge as you ought to do of it without any of my reflections."

This letter shows conclusively that there was other evidence against Penn besides what the notorious Fuller may have said. Sydney says that Penn would give no positive answer "to the letters that were found with my Lord Preston and the paper of the conference." How far the letters criminated Penn we cannot tell. Lord Preston, when brought before William to confess and save his life, had directly implicated Penn, as we are informed by Dalrymple.

"He confessed against the bishops and Clarendon, and many of the known partisans of the late king. He then named among his associates the Duke of Ormond, the Lords Dartmouth, Macclesfield, Brandon, and Mr. Pen, the Quaker; and added, Pen told him, that although Lord Dorset and Lord Devonshire had not attended the conference, they were of the party." (Dalrymple's Memoirs, part ii. book vi. p. 189.)

The conference here referred to, and also mentioned by Sydney in his interview with Penn, is de-

scribed for us by both Dalrymple and Burnet. Some of the Whigs, it seems, who had at first favored William were now disgusted with him. He was worse, they said, than James, who had at least sacredly respected the habeas corpus law, which William did not respect at all and had suspended; and they went on to tell how he had dragged England into a foreign war and allowed the navy, whose glory had been unsullied for centuries, to be disastrously defeated. They joined themselves to some of the Tories who were like-minded, and then called to their aid the close adherents of James. A conference was held which resulted in sending Preston and some others to James with the papers that were found on them when they were caught.

The opinion of the participants in this conference, Burnet tells us, was that if James were brought back France would be inclined to oblige rather than to conquer England, and that James himself would be governed by Protestants and follow Protestant and English interests; in other words, be a liberal tolerant ruler as good as William, and probably much better. These are very much like Penn's views expressed on various occasions, and it is not at all unlikely that he was connected in some way with this conference.

His biographers have, however, carefully obscured all this evidence which I have been describing, as if any connection with the conference was a frightful crime, from the imputation of which they must protect Penn at all hazards. But it is not a question of crime, it is merely a question of political opinion.

There were thousands like Penn who could not then see, what time has since shown, that William in the end would be the safer ruler of England. These people were deluded and mistaken, but not criminals.

To show their delusion, Dalrymple goes on to tell how the conference proposed that when Louis XIV. should start with his army and fleet to help James land in England, he must first of all declare religious liberty in France, so as to make his invasion of England seem less distasteful to English Protestants. This was precisely the sort of wild notion that would attract Penn. He would believe, as he had often believed of James's temporary indulgences of freedom in England, that the benefits of such liberty to trade, commerce, and all the departments of life would in a few weeks become so apparent that religious freedom would be adopted all over Europe.

The conference also proposed that the French king with his fleet and army must act only as a mediator between James and his people, and not as an ally of James to conquer the English people, and that James must remove all his Roman Catholic advisers, and publish a declaration that he would send back the French fleet and army as soon as William's forces should withdraw, and that he would refer all subjects of dispute to a free Parliament. In other words, the wolf would be entirely acceptable as king of the sheep if he would promise not to be a wolf. These were the same delusions Penn had been indulging in about James for the last five years,

and the conference must have suited him exactly, and had his full sympathy if not his active participation.

When Penn said to Sydney that he knew of no plot, nor did he believe there was any except what King Louis had laid, he was making a rather strong statement, at which some have smiled and others shaken their heads. Macaulay calls it a downright lie, and Penn's biographer, Stoughton, admits that he cannot swallow it. Penn may have meant that he had no personal or actual knowledge of a plot from having participated in it. But that he did not know of the existence of plots and their general intention and methods is impossible to suppose.

In his interview with Sydney he placed himself in this position: that he was not plotting, and he knew of no plot; he could explain the evidence against him in a private interview with the king, and at the same time give the king valuable information, but he would not be a witness in a trial because he could not take an oath. If not allowed to explain himself to the king, he would have to quit the kingdom.

This seems to show that Penn was somewhat inclined to turn state's evidence. He evidently dreads a formal trial; but seems to have no fear of a direct interview with King William, possibly for the reason that William was well known to be very liberal and magnanimous in these matters. William was then in Ireland, and the interview with him was not granted. Penn remained for some months in his concealment, or privacy, as he called it, apparently

unmolested. The concluding words of Sydney's letter are obscure, but they seem to me to imply that he thought Penn was not dangerous to the government.

Two months afterwards we have a letter from Penn to Sydney, dated "22d A 91," in which he urges Sydney to prevail with the king not to entertain "hard things" of him which ignorance, art, and prejudice have suggested." He asks to be allowed to live quietly anywhere in England or America. He promises to make no ill use of this favor, and adds that the Quakers will be the pledges of his peaceful living. He goes on in a very humble manner to say that the king will never regret granting this request. Then he hints that it may also be worth while for the king to oblige him, and not make him and his family any more unhappy than they are already. He has gone through enough, he says, in the last two years "to have provoked, it may be, a better man to a less peaceable and submissive conduct."

This mysterious mingling of humility and threats leaves us more in the dark than ever. Penn in effect says, if you continue to oppress me, I may be driven from my neutral position and do you an injury. He seems to have heard something more about William's disposition towards him, for he closes by saying, "I confess I can by no means think him so prejudiced or implacable as some represent him in my affair;" and then he adds the hint and threat, "therefore I have refused all other offers of future safety or accommodation."

Did Penn still possess some valuable information, as he said in the interview with Sydney, and was he trying to barter it for his future safety?

Sydney is reported by Penn to have answered that "the King took it so, as I should not have been displeased to have heard it." And later Penn writes again to Sydney.

"Let me be believed and I am ready to appear; but when I remember how they began to use me in Ireland upon corrupt evidence before this business, and what some ill people have threatened here, besides those under temptation, and the providences that have successively appeared for my preservation under this retirement I can not without unjustifiable presumption put myself into the power of my enemies."

This statement seems to imply that there had been some previous communication which has not come down to us. Penn says that if they will believe what he will tell, he is ready to appear. He was still trying to avoid a trial. He wished to come into the king's presence, tell him everything he knew, and have that accepted instead of a trial. Or, in other words, if the king would promise him that there should be no trial, he would appear and tell everything. The rest of the statement seems to mean that he has already been so badly handled in Ireland on corrupt evidence, and had so many narrow escapes in England, that it would be foolish to give himself up voluntarily, and foolish to appear in any way unless he was promised indemnity. The trouble in Ireland to which he refers was that he had been indicted there by the grand jury for treasonable conspiracy, and although he

had never been tried on the indictment, the rents of his Irish estates had been confiscated pending the trial.

What he says about the providences that have preserved him since his concealment would seem to imply that many things had happened of which no account has come down to us. Indeed, the impression we obtain from all we read of him at this period is that a great deal was going on between him and the government of which no record has been preserved. He goes on to say in the letter to Sydney, just quoted,—

"Let it be enough to say and that truly, I know of no invasions or insurrections, men, money, or arms, for them, or any juncto or consult, for advice or correspondency in order to it. Nor have I ever met with those named as the members of this conspiracy, or prepared any measures with them, or any else for the Lord's [Sunderland?] to carry with him as one sense or judgment, nor did I know of his being sent for up for any such voyage. If I saw him a few days before by his great importunity, as some say, I am able to defend [myself] from the imputations cast upon me, and that with great truth and sincerity. Though in rigor, perhaps, it may incur the censure of a misdemeanor, and therefore I have no reason to own it without an assurance that no hurt should ensue to me."

Here we have, as it seems, an instance of the sort of evidence that, without his being able to prevent it, was accumulating against Penn. As an old friend of James he could not help occasionally seeing and talking with those who were more or less actively engaged in plotting for James's return. He admits that he has been with one such person whom it would have been better not to have seen. He adds, also, that this person insisted on seeing him. At the

close of the letter he says, "Let me go to America or be protected here."

Sydney's answer was that the king was in too great a hurry to attend to this letter, but he would bring it to his attention again in Holland, whither he was going. Penn says he wrote a similar letter to Lady Reneleagh, asking her to intercede on his behalf with the queen. "What else can I do?" he says. "I know false witnesses are rife against me, both here and in Ireland."

He was evidently in great trouble, and not enjoying the easy retirement his biographers would have us suppose. These last communications with Sydney and Lady Reneleagh were presumably in May or June. Two or three months afterwards, in September, 1691, Narcissus Luttrell enters in his diary for the 18th of that month that Penn left England and went to France.* This was in accordance with what he had said, that if King William would not hear him in person and free him from the danger of a trial, he must leave the country.

This passage in Luttrell's diary, though noticed by Macaulay, is not even mentioned by any of the biographers of Penn, nor do they say anything of his going to France. If they think that Luttrell is mistaken, and that Penn did not leave England, they should say so, and give their reasons. But to pass by in silence such an important authority as Luttrell is hardly fair to their readers. They make no

* "Wm Penn the Quaker is got off from Shoreham in Sussex and gone to France." (Vol. ii. p. 286.)

attempt to explain the long blank in Penn's life from the summer of 1691, when he ceased corresponding with Sydney, to the close of 1693, a period of over two years, during which we do not know what he was doing or where he was. They skip their confiding readers across this gulf without letting them know of its existence.

Whether Penn remained any length of time in France we cannot tell. There is a letter of his to Robert Turner, in Pennsylvania, dated at London, November 29, 1692,* a little more than a year after Luttrell says he went to France. The date of this letter is about a month after King William had deprived him of the government of Pennsylvania; and this loss may have brought him to London. The seizure of his government may have been because the king had become more suspicious of him. That he led a very wandering life during all the three years of his concealment we are compelled to believe from his own words already quoted.

"I have been above these three years hunted up and down, and could never be allowed to live quietly in city or country." (Janney, p. 367.)

These words are in a letter not dated, but evidently, from the contents, written towards the end of his concealment. The king and queen, he says, are still against him, and apparently so much so that he considers himself still in danger. If he could only make them believe that he was not working against them, and that he would "sequester himself out of

* Janney, p. 364.

the way of having it in his power to offend them," they would not, he thinks, be so violently prejudiced. But he cannot convince them of it, and so commits himself and family to the good and merciful God. He goes on to tell in full about the indictment against him in Ireland and the confiscation of the rents of his estates there although he had not been tried.

Some time afterwards he appears to have been in negotiation with Lord Rochester, to make his peace for him with the king, for we have an undated letter of his to Rochester, from which it would seem that Rochester had asked whether, if the king acquitted him, he would go to Pennsylvania. Penn says he certainly would go there, because his affairs in that province are in a bad way. But he cannot start before the following spring because he must first go to Ireland to recover what he could of his ruined estates and get rid of the indictment there. Meantime, he will follow his "own occasions in as private and inoffensive a manner as he can."

The government may have thought it a good plan to get rid of Penn and all possible danger from him by making sure that he would cross three thousand miles of ocean to Pennsylvania. This Penn suspected, and he adds, "I will not receive my liberty to go as a condition to go there, and be there as here looked upon as an articled exile."

But the end of his troubles was near. Towards the close of the year 1693 the government began to consider him as no longer dangerous. Several of

the noblemen to whom he had already several times appealed—Rochester, Reneleagh, and Sydney—now interceded for him with the king, and he has himself described the result in a letter to his friends in Pennsylvania.

"This comes by the Pennsylvania Merchant,—Harrison, commander, and C. Saunders, merchant. By them and this know, that it hath pleased God to work my enlargement, by three Lords representing my case as not only hard, but oppressive; that there was nothing against me but what impostors, or those that are fled, or that have, since their pardon refused to verify (and asked me pardon for saying what they did), alleged against me; that they had long known me, some of them thirty years, and had never known me to do an ill thing, but many good offices; and that for not being thought to go abroad in defiance of the Government, I might and would have done it two years ago; and that I was, therefore, willing to wait to go about my affairs, as before, with leave; that I might be the better respected in the liberty I took to follow it.

"King William answered, 'That I was his old acquaintance, as well as theirs; and that I might follow my business as freely as ever; and that he had nothing to say to me,'—upon which they pressed him to command one of them to declare the same to the Secretary of State, Sir John Trenchard, that if I came to him, or otherwise, he might signify the same to me, which he also did. The Lords were Rochester, Reneleagh, and Sydney; and the last as my greatest acquaintance, was to tell the Secretary; accordingly he did; and the Secretary, after speaking himself, and having it from King William's own mouth, appointed me a time to meet him at home; and did with the Marquis of Winchester, and told me I was as free as ever; and as he doubted not my prudence about my quiet living, for he assured me I should not be molested or injured in any of my affairs, at least while he held that post. The Secretary is my old friend, and one I served after the D. of Monmouth and Lord Russel's business; I carried him in my coach to Windsor, and presented him to King James; and when the Revolution came, he bought my four horses that carried us. It was about three or four months before the Revolution. The Lords spoke the 25th of November, and he discharged me on the 30th.

"From the Secretary I went to our meeting, at the Bull and Mouth; thence to visit the sanctuary of my solitude; and after that

to see my poor wife and children; the eldest being with me all this while. My wife is yet weakly; but I am not without hopes of her recovery, who is of the best of wives and women."

From this passage we learn that, when he was a courtier in King James's time, Penn lived in a style rather more magnificent than we now usually associate with Quakers, for he speaks of riding in his coach and four to visit the king. There were, however, other instances of this luxury among Quakers, especially in Pennsylvania, where at the time of the Revolution of 1776 John Dickinson is described as riding in a coach and four.

Narcissus Luttrell, in his diary for December 5, 1693, speaks of Penn's acquittal by King William rather more bluntly than Penn himself describes it.

"Wm. Penn, the Quaker, having for some time absconded, and having compromised the matters against him, appears now in public, and on Friday last held forth at the Bull and Mouth in St. Martin's." (Vol. iii. p. 237.)

After having assailed Penn through two volumes of his history, Macaulay at this point fires his last shot.

"The return which he made for the lenity with which he had been treated does not much raise his character. Scarcely had he again begun to harrangue in public about the unlawfulness of war, when he sent a message earnestly exhorting James to make an immediate descent on England with thirty thousand men."

The message here referred to was contained in a document sent to James and professing to inform him what some of his prominent adherents in England thought of his chances of getting back his crown.

"Mr. Penn says that your Majesty has had several occasions, but never any so favorable as the present; and he hopes that your Majesty will be earnest with the most Christian king not to neglect it: that a descent with thirty thousand men will not only re-establish your Majesty, but according to all appearance break the league." (Macpherson's "Original Papers," vol. i. p. 468.)

This is the language of a Roman Catholic, not of a Quaker; for Penn is represented as calling Louis XIV. the most Christian king, and he urges James to join with that king in a descent on England which will not only restore him to the throne, but break up the Protestant league which William was maintaining by arms against France. If Penn really used such language as this, it is not surprising that they suspected him of being a Jesuit.

But it is difficult to believe that he said anything so inconsistent with the other expressions of his opinion which we have. He has told us, in passages which we have already quoted, that he had more hope for religious liberty under James than under William. He unquestionably would have liked to see James again on the throne. But I must confess I am not prepared to hear him urge a French invasion of England to accomplish this purpose.

It is still more difficult to believe that he expressed it in the language reported. The report, it should be remembered, is made by a Roman Catholic, who does not apparently pretend to give Penn's words, but only the substance of what he said. The man who made this report was one Williamson, who was regularly employed to bring information from England. In the letter in which he gives Penn's opinion will be found his reports of

what about a dozen other friends of James thought on the subject of his return, and all these reports are expressed in the same conventional form, and they all speak of the thirty thousand men that are to descend on England.

There is no evidence that Williamson spoke directly with Penn in order to obtain his opinion. He may have heard in a roundabout way something which he chose to consider as Penn's opinion. People may have told him what they understood Penn's opinion to be, and Williamson may have entered it as a make-weight in his reports. As evidence, his report seems to me very weak. It seems all the weaker when we find that twenty years later, in December, 1713, another information collector named Plunket reports Penn as one of those who could be relied on by the pretender to the English throne. Plunket could not possibly have communicated with Penn; for in December, 1713, he had been out of his mind for a year and a half.*

But we need concern ourselves no further with these reports, for the English government never again interfered with Penn, and we shall hear no more of his relations with William III. During those three years of hiding, he had employed his leisure in writing several pamphlets, most of them defences of Quaker doctrine, such as "The New Athenians no Noble Bereans" and "A Key to the Quaker Religion." During that time, also, he wrote his collection of maxims called "Fruits of Solitude." But

* Clarkson's Penn, vol. ii. p. 290.

the most interesting pamphlet he wrote during his concealment was "An Essay towards the Present Peace of Europe." In this he advocated what has ever since been agitating the minds of philanthropists and public men,—a system of arbitration or general government to settle all the disputes of the European nations and prevent war. He proposed to have a United States of Europe, with a diet or general council, to which each state should send its representatives; and he even went so far as to suggest the number each nation should send.

Here we have Penn at his best in the midst of his worst. While in punishment and hiding for upholding a narrow-minded and stupid despot, he advocates a broad and generous principle which that despot could never have comprehended. The remarkable part of Penn's mind was the ready and courageous way in which he conceived and advocated liberal ideas far in advance of his time; and yet this faculty could not save him from the delusion of following James II. and wasting the best years of his life in attempting to introduce liberty into England by the assistance of a man who hated liberty with all his heart.

Penn's wife Guli, who, as a pretty young girl, appeared in this narrative when she married, twenty odd years ago, was now a woman of middle age. It is said that she had gone every year to France since James was dethroned, carrying to him and his queen the little presents and tokens of devotion which his adherents in England were fond of sending. It is said, also, that she was always affectionately received,

although she declared that the revolution was indispensable, and that she came only for the sake of friendship and gratitude.*

At the time Penn obtained his freedom from William she had been for some time in very ill health, and about three months afterwards, February 23, 169$\frac{3}{4}$, she died. He has left a touching description of her death, too long to quote in full.

"She would not suffer me to neglect any public meeting after I had my liberty, upon her account, saying often, 'Oh, go, my dearest; do not hinder any good for me. I desire thee go; I have cast my care upon the Lord: I shall see thee again."

The man who was now known in the world as the Great Quaker, Proprietor and Governor of his Majesty's Colony of Pennsylvania, was in a very sad plight,—his wife dead, his influence as a courtier worse than lost, his property wasted, and his high-sounding province a source of cruel expense to him. He wanted to go at once to that province, but was faced by the humiliating condition that he could not scrape together enough money to take him there. He wrote a pathetic letter to his friends in the province, describing his losses, and asked that a hundred of the colonists should each lend him a hundred pounds for four years free of interest, and after four years with interest; his own bond to be given as security. I am sorry to be obliged to relate that there was not the slightest notice taken in Pennsylvania of this very reasonable request. Penn had said that if they would not lend him the whole £10,000 which he

* Strickland's Queens of England, Mary Beatrice.

asked for, he would be satisfied if they would lend him as much as they could. But they never lent him a penny.

It may be said here, in partial explanation of this conduct, that Penn was not then popular in Pennsylvania. His attempt to govern the colony at a distance of three thousand miles through the disturbed reign of James II. and the years that followed the revolution had been a failure. He had also lost caste among the Quakers. Many of them were in favor of King William rather than James, and Penn had now for many years been deep in politics and a courtier's occupations, which was all inconsistent with the practice and principles of his people. They could excuse a great deal for the sake of his distinguished position and the good he had been able to do them, but he had gone entirely too far. There is no doubt that at this time they regarded him with coldness.

This I know has been vehemently denied by some who deny everything that does not tend to manufacture Penn into a saint. Clarkson, however, admits in the fullest manner that Penn had been deserted by a large number of his people, which, added to the detestation in which he was held by the followers of William, made him almost an outcast of society. Clarkson implies that the Quaker disapproval of him was only because "he had meddled more with politics or with the concerns of government than became a member of their Christian body." But the disapproval was for more than this. It was for the part he had taken in the revolution.

Thomas Lower, a prominent Quaker, prepared a paper for Penn to sign, in the hope of bringing about a reconciliation. In this he was to be made to say,—

"And if in any things during these late revolutions I have concerned myself either by words or writings (in love pity or good will to any in distress) further than consisted with Truth's honor or the Church's peace, I am sorry for it; and the government having passed it by I desire it may be by you also, that so we may be all kept and preserved in the holy tie." (Clarkson, vol. ii. p. 75; Stoughton, p. 270.)

In other words, Lower, as representing the Quakers, believed that Penn had gone wrong in the revolution; that the government had pardoned him for it, and that he ought to ask pardon from the Quakers. He must apologize for having assisted "in love pity or good will" King James "in distress." He would never have been asked to sign such a strong statement as that unless the Quakers thought that there was a great deal to be forgiven. He, however, had always insisted that he was right, and of course refused to sign it.

A year or two afterwards, in the summer of 1694, there was, according to Clarkson, a complete reconciliation. He is obliged, however, to admit that "how this was effected is not known;" * and from subsequent events it seems likely that the reconciliation was not entirely complete.

* Vol. ii. p. 105.

XX

RETURNS TO HIS OLD WAY OF LIFE

THOUGH apparently anxious to return to Pennsylvania, Penn was unable to set out for six years, and I suppose for the reason that he had no money, and must stay in England to restore as far as possible his estates. In August, 1694, King William returned to him the goverment of his province. It had been taken from him, it seems, principally as a war measure; for a colony in the hands of a Quaker Jacobite might, too, easily become a prey to France.

During those six years that he remained in England, having ceased to be a courtier, he returned to his old life of preaching, and travelled for this purpose over England and Ireland. The meetings of his people and his own preaching were conducted under the Toleration Act of his enemy William III. By that act the Quakers obtained for their meetings a formal license, which was always granted, as a matter of course, and that license once obtained, no magistrates, constables, or soldiers could interfere with them. Persecution was ended forever, and Penn never again wrote on his old topic of religious liberty. But it would probably have been impossible to get him to admit that he owed this happy condition to William III. So far as we know, he never

announced any alteration of his old opinion that he had faith in King James's word for liberty.

His preaching journeys seem to have been eminently successful. Enormous numbers attended the meetings. He was now fifty years old, of mature powers, with considerable experience of the world and of all phases of society. The vicissitudes and troubles through which he had passed rendered him an object of interest to thousands who may not have approved of his course in the revolution, and may not have been Quakers.

The great numbers attending the meetings—sometimes several thousand—would lead us at first to suppose that the Quakers were very numerous. But from the descriptions of these meetings it is evident that many attended out of mere curiosity to see a remarkable man and learn something of this curious religion which had fought its way to respectability through such terrible martyrdom. All ranks and conditions, and even the clergy of the Established Church, came to listen. At one meeting in Ireland the bishop sent the mayor to disperse the people. Penn treated the mayor with great respect, and persuaded him to retire until the meeting was over, when he promised to call on the bishop. Upon Penn's remonstrating with the bishop, he said, "that he went that morning to church to perform his office as usual, and when there he had nobody to preach to but the mayor, church wardens, some of the constables, and the walls." He had, therefore, decided to disperse the great Quaker meeting in the hope of obtaining an auditory for himself.

HANNAH CALLOWHILL, PENN'S SECOND WIFE

In the spring of 1696, three years after the death of his first wife, Penn married Hannah Callowhill, of Bristol, and to her and to her children Pennsylvania descended, and not to Guli's offspring. Guli had had seven children, three of whom survived her,—Springett, William, and Letitia. But about five weeks after this second marriage Springett died.

He was a very religious young man, and his father wrote a long account of his death. It is very touching and tender, and an interesting revelation of the workings of the Quaker mind falling back upon itself and communing by the inward way with God. But there are some who will always resent a father's making in this way an exhibition of his son's death, even though it be for edification. His description of the last days of Guli also went rather far in this direction.

Of the two remaining children, William became a rake and Letitia married William Aubrey, who became a very disagreeable son-in-law to Penn. So Guli, who as a girl was so charming and married Penn with such romantic affection, passes out of his life leaving sad mementoes.

The next year, 1697, Penn left Worminghurst, which had been Guli's inheritance from her family, and took up his residence in Bristol, where his new wife belonged. Thus he started a fresh page in his domestic life, but continued his old habit of preaching and writing. By his second wife he had six children,—John, Thomas, Hannah, Margaret, Richard, and Dennis. Four of them—John, Thomas,

Margaret, and Richard—survived her and became the proprietors of Pennsylvania.

Peter the Great of Russia was then a youth living incognito in England and working in the ship-yards to inform his barbaric mind about that curious thing civilization, which he had heard would make a nation powerful. He thought it might accomplish something in his own frozen deserts. The Quakers, especially Penn, sought him out. He was rather unpromising material for a proselyte, and asked of what earthly use to a nation a people could be who would not fight. But Penn talked to him in German and gave him German Quaker books, with the result, it is said, that he always retained a great respect for the Quakers, and once in Denmark attended one of their meetings.

We also find Penn back at his old work of writing pamphlets on Quaker doctrine, and indulging occasionally in controversy with opponents of his faith. He disapproved of controversy as too disturbing to the peace of the church; but in practice he could seldom resist the temptation to fight a round or two in the ecclesiastical prize-ring. He loved it just as he loved politics; but I suppose wild horses could not have dragged from him an admission of such a worldly passion.

At this time we find him proposing to the Lords of Trade a plan of union or general government for the colonies in America, which is quite remarkable because it foreshadows some of the provisions of our national constitution. It is pleasant to find Penn once more himself after having been so long

PENN'S SON THOMAS

obscured in Jacobitism; and his mind was always at its best in proposing improvements far in advance of his time. He wanted a general government for the colonies, so as to make customs duties the same in all, regulate commerce and military quotas, and return absconding debtors. In other words, he was the first to call public attention to these difficulties, and he suggested the remedy which within a hundred years was carried into effect by the American people.*

At the Yearly Meeting of Quakers in London in 1697 there was a violent attack on his character, which shows that the reconciliation which Clarkson speaks of was by no means complete. But he could easily afford to disregard such things, for his hold on the people and his power as a preacher were strong, and there had been abundant manifestations of this in his recent journeys through England and Ireland. His words and presence seem to have been very efficacious in arousing in a meeting that peculiar state of mind, half serene, half exulting, which was the foundation of Quaker feeling.

He probably did his best preaching at this period, and his farewell sermon before sailing to Pennsylvania has been preserved, the only one of his sermons, so far as I can discover, that was taken down and kept for posterity. Quaker sermons are not of a sort to be admired in other religious bodies, and scarcely any of them are preserved, because their preservation might encourage vanity in the preacher.

---

* See The Evolution of the Constitution, p. 223.

This sermon of Penn's reads like a good but not a remarkable one, and seems to have a more modern tone than we should have expected.

We have a slight glimpse of his life and methods at this time in an account of his going to bid farewell to Thomas Story, who was about to sail for America. Penn, with other friends of Story, went on board the ship, and Penn, "after they had sat together in solemn silence, appeared in supplication for the well-being and preservation of all present, in reverent thankfulness for all the favors of God, and especially for the precious enjoyment of his divine presence which they then experienced." He certainly was a many-sided man, this Quaker courtier and politician.

In such occupations the six years passed away, and in September, 1699, he at last sailed for Pennsylvania. In a farewell letter to the people of his faith, after describing his love for them, which, he says, was like David's and Jonathan's, he refers to their disapproval of his conduct in the revolution.

"And suffer me to say, that, to my power, I have from the first endeavored to serve you (and my poor country), and that at *my own charges* with an upright mind, however *misunderstood and treated* by some whom I heartily forgive."

PENNSYLVANIA CASTLE

XXI

PENNSYLVANIA AGAIN

FIFTEEN years had elapsed since Penn's former visit to his province; and in that time how much had happened! In Great Britain a dynasty had been overthrown and a new England begun under improved ideas of liberty. Political government was returning more and more to the ancient Anglo-Saxon freedom, and England was starting out on an enlarged career of commercial success just as Penn had prophesied it would under the beneficent influences of religious liberty. In Pennsylvania the people had grown more numerous; they numbered now well on towards twenty thousand; but the province had given Penn as much trouble as old England and her revolution.

That while three thousand miles away and involved in a courtier's occupations, and after that hunted up and down as a conspirator, he should govern Pennsylvania well was not to be expected. He seems to have done well enough when he lived in the province, and very badly when away from it. There must have been something in his manner, some atractiveness of personality which gave him his best success when face to face with people. When he was directing men and measures from a distance he appears unreasonable, weak, inju-

dicious, censorious, and even illiberal. But when face to face with the same individuals he had no difficulties. It may have been a knowledge of this quality that when he was suspected of plots and conspiracies led him to insist so persistently on a personal interview with William III. He seems to have had perfect confidence that if he could once stand in sight of the king he could settle everything with him.

When he returned to England in the summer of 1684 he had delegated his power as governor of the province to the Provincial Council, which consisted of eighteen members, so that there were in effect eighteen governors. The Assembly of the people were very jealous of this Provincial Council, and resisted them at every opportunity. As the Assembly were not allowed to originate laws, they made up for their lack of power by rejecting, on the slightest pretext, those originated by the Council. They would pass no laws at all except on condition that they should be in force only one year. At the end of the year, unless the Council yielded to their wishes, they would refuse to renew the laws, which was, in effect, to leave the colony without any laws at all. They produced a dead-lock several times in this way, to the great annoyance of Penn. In the hope of checking their wrangling, he altered the arrangement, and, instead of having eighteen governors, reduced the number to five, whom he called commissioners.

To these commissioners he sent a letter of instructions, telling them to rule the colony with a

high hand. They had, he said, the power to enact, annul, or vary laws as if he himself were present. This was an extraordinary piece of news; for nobody had supposed that Penn himself had any such power. He certainly was not entitled to it under the charter which gave him the right to make laws only with the consent of the freemen or their delegates. If he could not make laws without the consent of the freemen, it was reasonable to suppose that he could not annul them without their consent.

But he went on in his instructions like an Eastern despot, ordering the commissioners to keep the Provincial Council to its duty. If that body, he said, continued its slothful and dishonorable methods, he would dissolve the whole frame of government; and the power to dissolve it he appeared to think rested entirely with himself. As a foretaste of what he could do, he told the commissioners that at the next meeting of the Assembly they were to announce that all the laws except the constitution itself were abrogated. They were then to dismiss the Assembly, and, having called it again, pass such of the laws afresh as seemed proper.

This strange outbreak is explained when we look at its date and find that it was in the year 1686, soon after James II. had ascended the throne and Penn had become one of his courtiers and a supporter of his policy. Penn must needs assert the same power that his royal master professed to have, —the right to suspend laws at his pleasure.

Such an assumption of power over his colony would have created a great commotion among the

people, if it had become known. But fortunately for him the commissioners kept his instructions secret, wisely forebore to act upon them, and went on governing in the usual way.

The province was giving him trouble enough without the outbreak and rebellion which his instructions might have caused. The commissioners had hardly been in office a year before he again changed the form of government, and in place of the commissioners appointed a single deputy governor, Captain John Blackwell, an old Cromwellian soldier. But the Quakers resented the appointment of a professional soldier, a soldier, too, who was all the more disliked for being a Puritan from New England. They made it so hot for him that he asked to be relieved from his ludicrous position. So this experiment also failed after being tried only a year.

Then he went back again to the plan of having the whole Provincial Council act as governor. But in 1692 this was changed, and he tried a single deputy governor again. In the ten years since the foundation of the colony the government had been changed six times; and in a few months there was another change, when William III. took possession of Pennsylvania and appointed over it a military governor, or captain-general, as he was called,—Colonel Benjamin Fletcher.

This Fletcher had also a stormy time in ruling the province. But Penn was deprived of Pennsylvania only a year and ten months from October 20, 1692, to August 20, 1694. When he received it back

again, he appointed his cousin, Markham, to be deputy governor, but gave him two assistants whose advice he was compelled to accept, so that in effect there were three deputy governors. Markham, however, managed to get on after a fashion, and held his post for five years, rather longer than any of the other experiments. He remained, in fact, until Penn arrived in 1699. The people secured from Markham many liberties, and the Assembly secured for itself the privilege of originating legislation which Penn had confined to the Council.

These difficulties and constant changes in the government seem to show very injudicious management. But the worst part of the business was that instead of bringing him in large returns from quit-rents, the province was involving him deeper and deeper in debt. He had been bearing the expense of the government, paying salaries, and spending money on his country place at Pennsbury, all in a generous spirit to push on the fortunes of the colony and give it prosperity and success. His bungling arrangements with the government were also well meant. But in all there is a total lack of skilful and business-like method.

However, he was now on the sea bound for his colony to govern it in person. He had his family with him, and there is every indication that he intended to spend a long time in Pennsylvania if not end his days there. The voyage was a very long one of over three months. But at last the ship entered the Delaware towards the end of November, about a month later than he had arrived on his previous

visit. She was evidently very slow in working her way up the river; for on the 30th, at New Castle, Penn took to a small boat and was rowed to Chester, the same place where he had landed when he first came out to the colony.

It had become known along the river that the great proprietor and governor had arrived, and Thomas Story hastened from New Castle to meet him at Chester. This was the distinguished Quaker, to whom, when setting out some time before on his travels in America, Penn had bidden farewell. It must have been interesting for these two men, who had seen and known so much in England, to meet suddenly in this little village in the American wilderness. They lodged together at the house of a Quaker, Lydia Wade, who lived close to Chester; and Story, no doubt, described to Penn the frightful scenes some months before when the yellow fever, or Barbadoes distemper, as some called it, had visited Philadelphia, killing two hundred and fifteen people and frightening the most careless into seriousness. But for the most part that evening, as Story tells us in his diary, they talked about "matters of government," possibly English affairs, but more likely the troublesome government of Pennsylvania.

The next day, the ship having caught up to Penn, he went with her to Philadelphia. He arrived on Sunday, and after distributing six pounds, a large sum in those days, as a largess to the crew, he went on shore, paid a short visit to his deputy governor, Markham, and then attended the Quaker meeting, where he preached, no doubt, with much effect; for

JAMES LOGAN

the occasion must have been to him a very interesting one.

He had brought out with him, as his secretary, James Logan, who settled in the colony and became one of its most prominent and distinguished men. He took charge of all Penn's affairs, and on Penn's death represented the family in the province for the rest of his life.

On their arrival at Philadelphia, he and Penn, with Mrs. Penn and Penn's daughter, Letitia, lived for a month at the house of Edward Shippen. After that they moved to the slate-roof house, as it was called, on the east side of Second street, north of Walnut. Penn rented it for two years, and used it for his town residence. His son John was born there, always known as John the American, and it was afterwards used by Logan as an office for the proprietary business. It should have been preserved as a relic, for in later years it had many interesting associations.

A large part of the inhabitants, especially the Quakers, seem to have been heartily glad to have Penn with them again. The party opposed to him was small, and was led by a certain Colonel Quarry, who represented the British government in the colony as judge of the admiralty, to see that the revenue laws were enforced; and he was also the leader of the Church of England people. He had bitterly opposed Penn before his arrival, and after Penn returned to England he opposed him again. But while Penn was in the province that faculty he had for dealing with people face to face seems to have

quieted all animosities. Almost as soon as he arrived he sent for Quarry, and they talked over their differences frankly and with good results.

In truth, Penn, being now on the ground, could remedy the matters of which Quarry had been complaining to the British government. One of these was piracy; and the home government had intimated rather strongly to Penn that unless he suppressed piracy in the neighborhood of his province he might forfeit his charter. I have elsewhere described the extraordinary prevalence of piracy in those times, and how prominent people and even colonial governors were interested in its profits.* Without going further into details, I may say here that some of the pirates were living comfortably in Philadelphia, and one of them, James Brown, had married Governor Markham's daughter.

Penn went to work on them with a strong hand, pursuing and arresting in a way which they probably did not expect from a Quaker preacher. But the Quakers were very active, energetic people in those days; and the best governor they ever had in the Carolinas in colonial times was a Quaker. In dealing with the son-in-law of his deputy governor Penn had a delicate matter on his hands, and the letter is still extant in which, in his very kindly way, he requires the deputy to be security for his precious son-in-law's appearance.†

He was busy enough with this and other matters,

* Men, Women, and Manners in Colonial Times, vol. ii. pp. 274–286.

† Buck's Penn in America, p. 238.

THE SLATE-ROOF HOUSE

surveying a manor of ten thousand acres at Rockhill, in Bucks County, for his new-born son, John the American; preaching at Quaker meetings in Pennsylvania and New Jersey; holding meetings of the Council and Assembly; attempting to have laws passed to regulate marriages among the negro slaves, and to break up the promiscuous concubinage among them, and also arranging for religious meetings among them and the Indians. Although very advanced in his ideas, he had not reached the point of opposing negro slavery, and he was himself a slaveholder.

He established the plan of having a night-watchman in Philadelphia, who should traverse the town at regular hours, announcing the time, describing the weather, and anything remarkable that had happened. This custom continued until long after the Revolution. Penn also urged upon the people the importance of carrying more effectually into practice the Quaker reform of making prisons workhouses and reformatories; and in after years the Pennsylvania system of prison discipline became the model for the rest of the country.

During his absence in England there had been so many changes in the constitution that its validity was in question. Markham had, without the approval of Penn, allowed the Assembly the right to originate laws and adjourn as they pleased. By these changes, made without his consent, Penn thought that the whole constitution had gone into abeyance, and could be revived only by writ. He had already acted on this idea, and had summoned

the Assembly by his own writ, as if it had not power to meet of itself. This was somewhat high-handed, but the people acquiesced in it, and as Penn, though fond of such assertions of power, never used them to oppress the colonists, it is difficult to find fault with him. To settle all doubts, he told them, in his broad, liberal way, to prepare a new constitution, and put in it anything they wanted. Meantime, they formally surrendered to him the old one, which shows that their confidence in him was by no means slight.

He was enjoying himself at his country-seat, Pennsbury, where he went to live in spring. It was twenty miles up the river, and there his chief interests were centred during the rest of his visit. The upper river was less interesting than the wide reaches and vast overflowed meadows below Philadelphia, with which he had become familiar on his first visit. But he soon surrounded himself with amusements at Pennsbury. He was fond of nature and a country life, and knew how to create a world of his own in the woods.

The building of the mansion house had been started during his first visit, and it is said to have cost £5000, which was certainly an extravagant sum to spend on a house in the wilderness. It was backed by vast forests, through which only a few roads and trails had been cut. We find Penn sending down to Philadelphia for a compass to guide him in his rides on horseback; and the large creeks not having been bridged, he could not drive in a wagon to Philadelphia.

He communicated with the town almost exclusively by boat. He had a fine barge, with six oarsmen; and he seems to have been very fond of these journeys by water. Of the barge itself he was particularly careful. "But above all dead things," he writes to his steward at Pennsbury, "my barge, I hope nobody uses it on any account, and that she is kept in a dry-dock, or at least covered from the weather." In this barge he was rowed to Philadelphia to attend the meetings of the Provincial Council; and if indisposed he would send the barge to bring the members of the Council to Pennsbury.

The house was built of brick, two stories and a half high and sixty feet in front, facing the river. There was a very large hall on the first floor, extending, it is supposed, the whole length of the house, and this was for meetings of the Council and for entertainments of all sorts, especially for the Indian chiefs who often came to see him. A small hall and three parlors are said to have communicated with this large room. The kitchen was in a separate building at the side, as was common at many of the country houses built in Pennsylvania in colonial times. There was also a brew-house, a laundry, and a stable for twelve horses; and all these out-buildings were on a line with the main house facing the river.

From the house to the river the ground was terraced, and an avenue of poplars shaded the path to the water. Gardens and a well-laid lawn extended all round the house, and vistas were cut through the

neighboring forest-trees to give views up and down the river. Penn sent out from England walnut-trees, hawthorns, hazels, and a great quantity of fruit-trees, and all sorts of seeds and roots. He had trees and shrubs brought from Maryland to experiment in their culture ; and had the native wild flowers transplanted into his gardens.

The house was well furnished with the pewter, silver, and chinaware used at that time, handsome oak and walnut chairs and tables, satin curtains, a good supply of sherry, madeira, canary, and claret in the cellar, and six large vessels called cisterns for holding water or beer, which were probably used in entertaining the Indians. He once, it is said, gave the chiefs a grand feast at a table spread for them in the avenue, and provided a hundred turkeys, besides venison.

He appears to have had a coach, a calash, and a sedan chair. The coach and calash may have been used at Pennsbury, but the chair was probably used only in the town. Most of his travelling was done on horseback, and his wife and daughter appear to have amused themselves in this way, for three side-saddles and two pillions are enumerated among the articles at Pennsbury. He was rather fond of good horses, and brought with him from England on this visit a fine colt called Tamerlane, sired, it is supposed, by the famous British stallion Godolphin. It has also been inferred that Penn used a shot-gun at Pennsbury, for in his cash-book there is an entry, "repair of the governor's gun."

He seems to have wandered on horseback all over

the country for a circuit of thirty or forty miles round Philadelphia ; and we can be quite sure that all the prominent places we now know so well were carefully examined by him when there was nothing much to be seen but forest-trees or an Indian clearing. Many of these excursions were taken for the purpose of looking at manors or tracts which his surveyors were marking out. He also made a long expedition to the Susquehanna, as he had done on his former visit.

It was on his return from this expedition, as is supposed, that he was lost for a time on the hill near Valley Forge. He wandered aimlessly until, crossing Valley Creek and ascending the hill on the south of it, he saw the Schuylkill, which gave him his true direction. He named the hill which misled him, Mount Misery, and the hill from which he saw the Schuylkill, Mount Joy, and they are still sometimes called by those names.

A pretty story is told of his riding one day to the meeting-house at Haverford, west of Philadelphia, and overtaking a little barefooted girl, Rebecca Wood, who afterwards told the story, also going to the meeting. He took her up behind him on the horse, and the two rode on, the little girl with her bare legs dangling against the horse's side, and the governor with his long coat and knee-breeches.

Judging from the entries in his cash-book, he gave away a considerable sum in charity to all sorts of poor people, and even after he returned to England he instructed his secretary to continue these gifts. He and his family were fond of attending fairs and

the Indian dances called canticoes. Numerous speeches of Penn to the Indians have come down to us, and, like all such speeches, they seem very plausible and unanswerable, or, at least, the answers of the Indians are not usually reported. The Pennsylvania Germans have, however, preserved an answer some Indians made to Penn, and it does not appear that Penn replied.

"You ask us to believe in the great Creator and Ruler of heaven and earth, and yet you yourself do not believe nor trust Him, for you have taken the land unto yourself which we and our friends occupied in common. You scheme night and day how you may preserve it so that none can take it from you. Yea, you even scheme beyond your life and parcel it out between your children,—this manor for one child, that manor for another. We believe in God the Creator and Ruler of heaven and earth. He maintains the sun; He maintained our fathers for so many, many moons. He maintains us, and we believe and are sure that He will also protect our children as well as ourselves. And so long as we have this faith we trust in Him, and never bequeath a foot of ground." (Sachse's "German Pietists in America," p. 150.)

Besides his Pennsylvania journeys, Penn travelled to New Jersey, New York, and Maryland. These journeys were partly for the purpose of seeing the country and partly in continuance of his old habit of visiting the Quakers and preaching at their meetings. A Quaker meeting at Easton, Maryland, has preserved the record of one of these visits in the year 1700.

"We were at a Yearly Meeting at Tredhaven, in Maryland, upon the Eastern shore, to which meeting for worship came Wm. Penn, Lord and Lady Baltimore, with their retinue; but it was late when they came, and the strength and glory of the heavenly power of the Lord was going off from the meeting. The lady was much disap-

pointed, as I understand from Wm. Penn, for she told him she did not want to hear him, and such as he, for he was a scholar and a wise man, and she did not question but he could preach; but she wanted to hear some of our mechanics preach, as husbandmen, shoemakers, and such like rustics, for she thought they could not preach to any purpose. Wm. Penn told her 'some of these were rather the best preachers we had among us.'" (Buck's "Penn in America," p. 320.)

In such employments and pleasures he passed nearly two years. The full details of his acts as a governor, his dealings with the Assembly, and his troubles with the three lower counties, as Delaware was then called, are given in full by some of his biographers, and best of all by Janney and by Buck. I can touch on these subjects only lightly and merely say that he seemed to manage all these affairs easily and without the gnawing care and annoyance which they gave him in England. He was still paying official salaries and assisting this person and that with money; and he declared that Pennsylvania now stood him a loss of £20,000.* The Assembly would do nothing to make this up, and the returns from his quit-rents and sales of land were very slow.

Still he seems to have intended to remain in his province for an indefinite period. He was enjoying to the utmost the wilderness and what he called "a country and proprietary life." But in the summer of 1701 he heard that there was a movement in England to turn all the proprietary governments into royal colonies under the direct rule of the crown, and that a bill for that purpose had been already

* Janney, p. 438.

introduced in Parliament. He felt that he must return to check this measure, and he prepared for his departure with the greatest regret. He hoped to return so soon that he wanted to leave his wife and daughter in Pennsylvania; but they insisted on returning with him.

In a letter to Logan at this time, after saying that all he has to dispose of in the world is in the province, he adds, "having no more gains by government to trust to for bread." * This chance sentence may possibly throw some light on the vexed question whether he had any position of profit under the government of James II.

At the close of October he was ready to sail; but before leaving he agreed with the Assembly on the new constitution he had promised them. It was a more simple document than those which had preceded it. There was no provincial council, or double house of legislature, but merely a governor to be appointed by him, and an assembly elected by the people; and this assembly had the right to choose its own speaker and other officers, originate laws, and could adjourn when it pleased. It was a very liberal government; for in many of the colonies the adjournment of the assembly was in control of the governor, who by that means could worry them into passing the laws he wanted.

The constitution abolished the provincial council, which had been a legislative body elected by the people like the assembly; and apparently there was

* Janney, p. 431

not even to be a governor's council; but Penn and his heirs after him always appointed a body of this sort to assist the governor; the people in vain protesting that it was unconstitutional. The constitution, as a whole, proved to be an excellent one, and the Pennsylvanians lived under it for seventy-five years, down to the outbreak of the Revolution, a longer period than they have lived under any of their subsequent frames of government.

XXII

A COURTIER AGAIN, AND AGAIN IN PRISON

WHEN Penn sailed away from his province, at the close of October, 1701, he thought he could quickly dispose of the measure in Parliament against the proprietary colonies, and would soon enjoy Pennsbury again. But he became absorbed in other things, and he never again returned to Pennsylvania.

He had a quick voyage of only a month, instead of the three months of his outward passage. But as soon as he arrived we find Pennsylvania becoming a torment to him, instead of the great pleasure it always seems to have been when he lived in it. His expenses were no doubt greater in England, which made his steady losses by the province more apparent. But a greater loss was to find that during the two years of his absence his son William had got into very evil ways of dissipation. This young man was the last of Guli's children,—bright and accomplished in a way, but he had been keeping "top company," as his father called it. He was married and had a family of children, but that seems to have been no restraint upon him.

In great bitterness of spirit, Penn ever after blamed this loss on Pennsylvania: for if he had not been absent there for two years, he thought he could have saved his son. As time passed and the young

man's condition became more and more irreclaimable, Penn became all the more convinced that if it had not been for those two years of separation he could have stopped the evil habits before they became so firmly fixed.

The best thing to do, he thought, was to send him out to the province, where there was very little "top company," where he could live at Pennsbury and enjoy the simple pleasures of the woods. He had, it seems, contracted heavy debts in England, and his creditors were beginning to press, which in those days meant imprisonment. Penn evidently hoped to reclaim his son by indulging part of his love of pleasure. He was to have hounds for hunting foxes, deer, and wolves, to be taken on fishing excursions, little journeys to see the Indians, and everything of that sort that was wholesome; and the servants at Pennsbury were instructed to take good care of his dogs. The young man, in short, was sent to America with a very expensive outfit, and, in a letter to Logan, Penn complains of this as another heavy loss. Logan was instructed to look after the wayward youth, get him good acquaintances, encourage Penn's old friends to be kind and helpful to him, and prevent, if possible, "rambling to New York and mongrel correspondence."

In the spring of 1702, a few months after Penn's return, William III. died, and I cannot find any record of Penn's sorrow on that occasion. Queen Anne succeeded to the throne. She was the daughter of James, but a Protestant, and married to a Protestant, Prince George of Denmark. She continued the Tol-

eration Act and the tests, and made no serious changes in the general policy established by William. But as the daughter of James she seemed to have kindly feelings for Penn, and he again became a courtier, living at Kensington in London, while his wife, for economy's sake, went to live for a time with her father.

In the fourteen years since William III. came to the throne England had greatly changed. The most striking change was that violence, cruelty, and brutal executions had largely passed away. All things were more regular and orderly. The court had become decent, and ribald conversation and obscenity were passing out of fashion. William and Mary were virtuous and honorable rulers, and set the example which is now the modern requirement in kings. The government was settled; civil war was not threatening every month; bright and independent minds were no longer living in banishment, or ornamenting the towns with their bleeding heads and quarters; the statesman who failed lost his office and not his head. In fact, under the liberty established by William III. the modern world was beginning to appear.

Literature was no longer monopolized by dramatists and theologians. Essayists, critics, and satirists began to show themselves. Journalism begins in this period and becomes recognized as a political force. Pope was now thirteen years old and was writing his first boyish epic. Swift was about to bring forth his "Battle of the Books" and "Tale of a Tub," in which he anticipated Carlisle. Addi-

son and Steele in a few years were writing the *Tatler* and the *Spectator.* Defoe had already written his "Essay on Projects," recommending insurance, friendly societies, savings-banks, insane asylums, and other modern methods. It was this book which in the previous volume of this series we described as having had such a profound influence on Franklin. In fact, we have now entered the period and the tone of thought which produced Franklin and his worldly-wise practical philosophy. This change from cruelty to philanthropy, from superstition to common sense, must have deeply interested Penn ; but he has left us no comments.

His return to court was fortunate, because he needed a courtier's influence to stop the measure in Parliament for abolishing proprietary colonies. But it was a very expensive life, and his financial condition grew worse and worse. Before he left Pennsylvania the very economical Quaker Assembly had voted him £2000, but that was a mere trifle ; and, besides, most of it was very slowly paid, and part, it seems, not paid at all.* He must have more, as he wrote to Logan, or he was undone.

"Never had poor man my task, with neither men nor money to assist me. I therefore strictly charge thee that thou represent to Friends there, that I am distressed for want of supply ; that I am forced to borrow money, and add debts to debts, instead of paying them off; besides, my uncomfortable distance from my family, and the unspeakable fatigue and vexation of following attendance, draughts of answer, conferences, council's opinions, hearings, &c., with the charge that follows them, guineas melting, four, five, six a

* Janney, p. 483.

week, and sometimes as many in a day. My wife hitherto has been maintained by her father. . . . Make return with all speed or I'm undone."

Soon after this the proprietorship of the Jerseys was abolished, and the two colonies of East and West Jersey made one under the direct government of the crown. This looked as if Pennsylvania might go the same way, and Penn had to double his exertions. Every one thought that the proprietor of such a mighty province must be rich. They think, he wrote Logan, "I have brought over the whole world with me." This was very inconvenient, "for," says Penn, "many call upon me for old scores." He had been evidently heaping up debts for a long time, which was a serious injury to the reputation of a Quaker, because the sect attached great importance to solvency, and sometimes disowned a member who suffered the misfortune of bankruptcy.

The Church of England party in the province, which had long opposed his interests, but had been depressed during his residence there, now sprang up again, and sent a representative to England to favor the taking of the province by the crown. The war of the Spanish succession which William III. had started was now raging, to the great destruction of British trade. Pennsylvania languished, and the colonists had an excuse for paying Penn neither quit-rents nor supplies. So he no doubt believed more firmly than ever that he had been right in supporting James against that William whose evil wars were still working such havoc. But furs

brought a high price in England, and Penn writes urgent letters to Logan to buy up and send him over as many as possible. So the great Quaker was in his distress trying to become a fur dealer; and if Logan had sent him enough peltries, a large part of his embarrassment might have been relieved.

People took the most annoying advantages of him. He had given some land to George Fox, who in his will left it to the Quakers of Pennsylvania. It had never been definitely located, and the thrifty Quaker meeting, wishing to have as valuable a gift as possible, demanded that it should be laid out in the heart of Philadelphia. Penn, I am glad to say, resisted this imposition. It seems the Quakers had not long before obtained from Governor Markham, but without Penn's consent, the land at Second and Market Streets which he had intended for his daughter. He also about this time discovered that Andrew Hamilton, whom he had appointed deputy governor of the province, was secretly favoring the party in England that wished to abolish the proprietorship. Yet, Hamilton dying at this time, Penn exerted himself to obtain employment for one of his sons.

So great were his difficulties that, as the movement to abolish the proprietary governments waned, he tried to turn the tables by himself proposing to sell his government to the crown. A good round sum obtained for it would pay his debts, relieve him from a world of annoyance and expense, and he would still remain the proprietor of the land and enjoy the quit-rents. He intended to part with no

more than his mere political right to govern. He would still, he wrote Logan, be able to come and live in the province and love it as much as ever. A great many Quakers, he says, were about to migrate to Pennsylvania, so that the superiority would be preserved. This plan of selling his right to govern he kept pressing for the next fifteen years, and came very near accomplishing it for a good price.

His son William finally went out to Pennsylvania in company with the new governor, one John Evans, a young man of only twenty-six years, to whom Penn had taken a fancy and fondly supposed he would be a check on his son. The two scamps at first, however, gave a very favorable impression. Logan was inclined to be hopeful, and others were not a little pleased and flattered by the manners and elegance of William, whose association with "top company" had not been without effect. He was taken up to Pennsbury to meet a hundred Indians who had come to pay their respects to the son of the only white man who could keep his word, and everything seemed very favorable. Logan took the young man to live with him in a large house which then stood at the southwest corner of Third and Chestnut Streets. No other place, says Logan, could be found suitable for the residence of the heir presumptive to the province. He was given a place in the Council and a seat next to the governor.

He succeeded in restraining himself within moderate bounds for considerably more than a year; but I suppose colonial life became at last too monot-

onous; for we find that one night he and his young friend, the governor, broke loose entirely, and in good old English roystering fashion began to beat the watch. They were in a public house at the time and quite drunk. Young Penn called for pistols; but the lights were put out, and he received a good thrashing from Alderman Wilcox, who pretended he could not recognize him in the darkness, and, when he announced himself as the heir presumptive, beat him again as a slanderer.

He was very indignant at this treatment, and also at being afterwards treated as a common rioter. The Quakers endeavored to deal with him for his misconduct; but he resented their attempt, resigned his membership, proclaimed himself no longer a Quaker, and determined to leave the colony. His father also, finding him as expensive as ever and unimproved in morals, preferred to have him come home. He would, he said, stop his allowance and let him face his creditors. He had been given a manor in Pennsylvania, which it was hoped he would look after, but he soon sold it for £850 to William Trent and Isaac Norris. It was a large tract of seven thousand acres, and the flourishing borough of Norristown now stands upon it. He needed the money for his expenses, he said, because his father did not give him enough. On reaching England, however, he immediately began to sponge again on his father, who was not told that he had sold the manor.

"A melancholy scene enough upon my poor child. Pennsylvania began it by my absence here, and there it is accomplished, with expense, disappointment, ingratitude, and poverty." (Janney, p. 467.)

He now placed his losses by the province at £30,000; a demagogue, David Lloyd, was exciting the colonists against him; and the young man Evans was becoming the worst deputy governor he had ever had.

"O Pennsylvania what hast thou cost me? Above £30,000 more than I ever got by it, two hazardous and most fatiguing voyages, my straits and slavery here, and my child's soul almost. . . . In short I must sell all or be undone, and disgraced into the bargain."

The Assembly, under the leadership of Lloyd, would not pay the deputy governor his salary of £400, which Penn was still compelled to pay. Yet Penn was all this time, and, indeed, all his life, fighting off Lord Baltimore's claim, which would have made Philadelphia a Maryland town, and doing his best to protect the colony from interference in Parliament.

He at this time supported Evans against the Assembly, who claimed that they had a right under the constitution to adjourn as they pleased. Evans contended, as his predecessor Hamilton had done, that they had a right to adjourn from day to day or for short periods within the session, but that the session could be closed and the Assembly finally adjourned only by the governor. Penn supported him in this because, as he was negotiating with the crown for the sale of his government, he could get a better price if the governor retained the same power of adjournment that governors in most of the other colonies had. The crown would not be likely to want to step into the shoes of a weak governor

among a people who were accustomed to their liberties. The Assembly passed a bill confirming in themselves the power of adjournment; but Evans refused his assent to it; and of this bill Penn said, "What a bargain should I have made for my government with the crown after such a bill had taken from me the power I should dispose of!"*

There was not a little resentment among the people, and the Assembly passed nine resolutions against Penn, which were referred to a committee instructed to prepare an address to be sent to him. The address, however, was sent without having been submitted to the house, and was more vindictively expressed than the house would have approved of. Lloyd seems to have drawn it and sent it without authority.

It charged Penn with having instructed his deputy to resist the right of adjournment, of allowing his colonists' consciences to be oppressed by oaths under royal orders, of suffering their laws to remain unconfirmed by the crown, and of extortion and corruption in the sale of land. His personal government while in the colony had been one of resentment and recrimination, and he had taken sides with the enemies of the province. The smallest point was seized upon and by adroit language magnified against him. He was reminded of his neglect to pay a former governor's salary, and he was impudently asked if the province was expected to discharge it. And, finally, he was informed that some-

* Janney, p. 478.

thing must be done to suppress vice, which had greatly increased since the arrival of his son.

This last was an unkind cut; and to make matters worse Lloyd sent the address to some Quakers in England who were the remains of the party that had been unfriendly to Penn since the revolution. They were told to use the address as they thought best.

But Lloyd had overreached himself. The address was too violent and offensive to be popular among the people of the province, and there was a strong reaction in favor of Penn, which quite unseated Lloyd and his party. The Assembly disapproved of the address, and even went so far as to vote £1200 for the support of government. Lloyd was ordered to recall the address, which he did, but accompanied the recall with a private letter to the bearer instructing him not to execute it.

Affairs went on so smoothly that Penn began to hesitate about selling the government to the crown, and everything might have continued in this happy condition if Evans had not attempted a boy's trick for scaring the Quakers. He had been trying to organize a militia for the province, and, meeting with much difficulty from Quaker principles, he arranged a plan for the day of the annual fair in Philadelphia, and had a messenger arrive in great haste and terror with the news that the French had entered the river in force and were moving on the city. Buckling on his sword and mounting his horse, he rode up and down among the people entreating them to arm and defend the province.

He succeeded in stirring up a slight alarm. The large vessels were sailed up the river; the small boats hidden in the creeks; and silverware and valuables thrown into wells. But the farce was soon over, and he gained just four militiamen, who came to the meeting he had appointed with their weapons. For these four he paid the price of ruining his career as governor. Popular feeling again turned against him, and Lloyd went once more into power. Evans tried to secure for Penn the proceeds of tavern licenses and fines and forfeitures; and also the right to establish courts of law by proclamation without the consent of the Assembly; but this only made matters worse.

The Assembly now attempted to strike at Penn through Logan, and Logan was formally impeached. But this failing, they prepared an address to be sent to Penn, in which they avoided the mistakes of violence and bitterness which Lloyd had made in the first one. There was nothing offensive in it; but Penn was reminded that unless the evil practices of his deputy governor were remedied the Assembly must appeal to the queen. Evans was becoming unbearable, and was guilty of gross immoralities with the Indians. There were other complaints about Penn's failure to have the Quakers relieved from administering oaths; but the main point of the address was the disgraceful conduct of Evans.

Some time before this another burden had been laid on Penn's shoulders by the marriage of his daughter, Letitia, to William Aubrey, who was very much of a man of business, "a scraping man," Penn

called him. He insisted on such prompt payment of his daughter's marriage portion, and was so continuously persistent about it, that Penn seems to have hated him more than he ever hated anybody.

Then just at the time of the Assembly's address about Evans there was a revelation in Penn's business affairs that was most unfortunate. He had had for a long time a steward or manager, Philip Ford, supposed to be a most exemplary Quaker, who had charge of his estates in England and Ireland. He was very fond of Ford, as he was of so many people, kings included, and he gave him ten thousand acres in Pennsylvania, a city lot in Philadelphia, one hundred and fifty acres in the suburbs, and seemed to think that he was scarcely giving him enough. But Ford had, it seems, other means of enriching himself.

He rendered accounts from time to time, which Penn, with his careless business habits, received and set aside without examination and without even opening some of them. Finally, when an investigation was made, it appeared that although Ford had received £17,000 of Penn's money and expended only £16,000, yet Penn owed him £10,500. He accomplished this remarkable result by charging compound interest at eight per cent. every six months on all advances, to which he added large commissions, charged again and again on the same sums, and an enormous salary. He allowed Penn no interest on receipts, and sometimes failed to set down money received.

Penn had for years been writing Logan how the



PENN'S BIBLE, WITH BOOK-PLATE

income from his estates in Great Britain was growing less and less, and now it was quite evident how the depreciation had occurred. It must have astonished Penn when Ford first reported to him that instead of any income from the estates the owner of the estates was in debt to the manager in some thousands of pounds. But still Penn made no investigation, and his debt to Ford kept rolling up. Ford pressed for payment, and Penn, still making no investigation, committed the monstrous folly of giving Ford a deed in fee simple of the whole province of Pennsylvania as security. Some time afterwards he committed another extraordinary piece of folly, and accepted from Ford a lease of the province. The lease was of course strong evidence to show that the deed was intended to be an absolute conveyance; and yet there is no doubt that Penn intended the deed to be only a mortgage.

It is probable that Ford also regarded it as only a mortgage, and during his life time the whole affair was kept secret. In fact, Penn seems to have always dealt with Ford in a private, confidential manner, and without taking advice from any one. During all this time it was never generally known that the great Quaker, as he was called, the proprietor and governor of her Majesty's colony of Pennsylvania, had been juggled out of his province by a book-keeper.

When Ford died, however, his widow and son made everything public; declared that the deed passed an absolute title, and announced themselves as the proprietors of Pennsylvania. They treated Penn as their tenant, and brought suit against him for

£3000 rent in arrear, and, having obtained a judgment for that amount, they had Penn arrested and imprisoned for debt. They even went so far as to attempt to get a proclamation from the crown declaring them to be the proprietors of Pennsylvania, and commanding the colonists to obey them.

When they arrested Penn the officers took him while he was at the meeting in Gracechurch Street, or, as the Londoners sometimes called it, Gracious Street. This must have been a strange and sad recalling of old times, for it was at this same meeting that he had been arrested thirty-seven years before when a young man for preaching to the Quakers; and it was under this arrest that he had so eloquently claimed the rights of a British freeman to a fair trial by jury.

For nine months the Fords kept Penn confined to the Fleet prison, and meantime his controversy with them was going through the tedious process of a chancery suit. His friends, however, were trying to effect a compromise. Penn had allowed the iniquitous account to run on so long, and had so often tacitly confirmed it, that the Fords had a strong case against him. But he displayed all his old courage and serenity in prison, to which he had been well seasoned in his youth. He was allowed rather comfortable quarters, and appears to have held small religious meetings there, as well as meetings of his friends. Isaac Norris, one of the most prominent colonists of Pennsylvania, was in London, and did all he could for him. He speaks particularly of his firmness and good spirits.

"After all, I think the fable of the palm good in him—'the more he is pressed, the more he rises.' He seems of a spirit fit to bear and rub through difficulties; and as thou observes his foundation remains. I have been at some meetings with him, and have been much comforted in them, and particularly last First-day." (Janney, p. 501.)

Before he had been imprisoned his friends were making good progress in raising money to enable him to settle with the Fords. But just at this point the hostile Quakers to whom Lloyd had sent the violent memorial came forward and made it public. The very serious charges in it staggered many of Penn's admirers, and an ill-feeling against him began to spread among the Quakers. Fortunately Norris, who was in London, had been in the Assembly when Lloyd sent the memorial, and he disclosed the truth about it. He certified in writing that the memorial as it stood had never been passed by the Assembly, nor even once read therein.

The manner of Penn's arrest, seizing him while at a religious meeting, began now to work in his favor by appealing to the better feelings of his people, arousing no doubt their recollections of the old days when he had freely gone to prison for their faith. The Fords had gone rather too far, for such severe treatment of a great man brought him unusual sympathy and assistance.

It was a sort of difficulty in which Penn always shone at his best, for he knew by long experience how to take it. He had, indeed, built up his reputation and attained the position which gave him influence largely by the heroic endurance of imprisonment. At the end of his nine months in the

Fleet £7600 was raised, and this the Fords accepted as a settlement; and a mortgage on Pennsylvania to secure that sum was given to the friends who had furnished the money.

But before this settlement was made they used the recent memorial the Assembly had sent to force Penn to dismiss Deputy-Governor Evans. It was strange how he clung to this man, in spite of the numerous proofs of his bad morals and vile conduct. He had written him a most gentle, kindly letter of rebuke, exhorting him to a better life. If Penn once liked a man, or believed in him, it was almost impossible for him to change his relations with him, in spite of the plainest evidence. He would probably have kept Evans if those three sturdy Quakers, Whitehead, Mead, and Lowther, to whom the Assembly's complaint was sent, had not visited him in prison and told him plainly that if he did not dismiss Evans they would lay the whole matter before the queen.

Even then he was determined to make it as easy for Evans as possible, and he wrote to Logan,—

"Pray break it to him and that the reason why I chose to change, rather than contest with the complaints before the queen in council, is, that he may stand the fairer for any employment elsewhere; which would be very doubtful if those blemishes were aggravated in such a presence."

XXIII

THE END

THE deputy governor Penn sent out in place of Evans was Colonel Charles Gookin, and Penn, of course, had a great fancy and liking for him, and sent a most flattering description of his good qualities to the colonists. Penn had presented him to the queen, who gave him her hand to kiss and wished him a good journey.

He had his difficulties with the Assembly. They objected very seriously to the instruction Penn had given him not to approve any law without the consent of his Council; for the Council, they said, had been given no power or even existence by the constitution of 1701, and by this instruction of Penn's it was given a secret control of legislation. Then they began to attack Logan, who they thought had entirely too much influence with the deputy governor and with Penn, and Logan replied with so many taunts on their past conduct and ill-treatment of Penn that they ordered his arrest, and he was taken on a writ issued by the speaker.

The governor, however, immediately released him, on the ground that the Assembly could not arrest any one outside of its own membership, and least of all a member of the Council. Logan sailed for England to lay the whole subject before Penn, who en-

tirely approved of his conduct. But before Logan could return there was another reaction in Penn's favor among the people. The Assembly had gone too far. The people believed that both the new governor and Penn were doing their best, and at the next election—in October, 1710—they returned an Assembly every member of which was on Penn's side. Lloyd was so discomfited that he went to live in Chester, and for the next two years he and his anti-proprietary party were seldom heard of.

This change in the feeling of the people, as soon as they saw the prospect of a little good government, shows that Penn was in reality very popular among them, and that if he had governed in person, or appointed fairly discreet deputies, there would have been no anti-proprietary party and few difficulties.

Before the election which turned everything in his favor took place, Penn wrote a long letter to the colonists, addressing them as "My old Friends," and dealing with them in a frank and affectionate manner, which seems to have increased their regard for him. He described the pleasure it had been to him to watch the early prosperity of the colony, and how it had since then been to him a cause of suffering.

"The many combats I have engaged in, the great pains and incredible expense to your welfare and ease, to the decay of my former estate, of which (however some there would represent it) I too sensibly feel the effects, with the undeserved opposition I have met with from thence, sink me into sorrow, that if not supported by a superior hand, might have overwhelmed me long ago. And I cannot but think it hard measure, that, while that has proved a land of freedom and flourishing, it should become to me, by whose means it was principally made a country, the cause of grief, trouble, and poverty."

PENN'S WRITING-DESK

He rehearses all the forms of government and privileges he had given them, discusses their grievances, and then goes on to tell of some of his own.

"The attacks on my reputation; the many indignities put upon me in papers sent over hither into the hands of those who could not be expected to make the most discreet and charitable use of them; the secret insinuations against my justice, besides the attempt made upon my estate; resolves passed in the Assemblies for turning my quit-rents, never sold by me, to the support of government; my lands entered upon without any regular method; my manors invaded (under pretence I had not duly surveyed them) and both these by persons principally concerned in these attempts against me here; a right to my overplus land unjustly claimed by the possessors of the tracts in which they are found; my private estate continually exhausting for the support of that government, both here and there, and no provision made for it by that country; to all which I cannot but add the violence that has been particularly shown to my secretary."

They were not an oppressed people, he said. The trifles of which they complained showed that they were strangers to real oppression. They complained that official fees were not settled by act of Assembly. By all means, let them settle those fees, and make them such as to encourage fit persons to undertake the offices. They had complained of the tavern-licenses, but that matter was now settled. They should remember that the eyes of all Europe were upon them: that many nations looked to them as a land of ease and quiet, wishing in vain for themselves the same blessings.

"What are the distresses, grievances and oppressions, that the papers, sent from thence, so often say you languish under, while others have cause to believe you have hitherto lived or might live, the happiest of any in the queen's dominions."

We find him at this time also writing to Logan about the supposed discovery of a silver-mine by a Swiss, named Michel, who had been prowling in the woods near Conestoga. In his poverty and need, Penn's imagination was easily aroused by such a suggestion. He had been told that the mine had already been secretly worked, and that his former deputy, Evans, had shared the profits.

"Pray scrutinize this matter well, and let me hear from thee with all the speed thou canst; for the assurance Michel gives me, makes me solicitous to pry into this affair, whence help may arrive to deliver me."

But he was soon convinced that there was more help to be had in a sale of his government to the crown than in any silver-mines on the Susquehanna, and he kept on trying to make a bargain. Everything was becoming easier for him. The settlement of the Ford claim had stopped an exhausting drain on his resources, and he could now get some returns from his English property. The deputy governor got on tolerably well with the Assembly. They regulated official fees, established a judiciary system and a systematic revenue system, and the province was rapidly settling down into the well-regulated sort of commonwealth Penn had always wished to see it. It is pleasant to be able to think that he enjoyed about three years of this quiet and prosperity.

He had given up his attendance at court, for the movement against the proprietary colonies had ceased and there was nothing more for him to do there for the Quakers. He was now nearly seventy

years old, and seems to have at last abandoned all intention of returning to Pennsylvania. But for eight or nine years after his return to England, in 1701, he had clung to the thought of quickly going back, and was continually writing Logan that if he could only settle his wretched affairs at home, he would fly with delight to America.

Meantime, in spite of the difficulty with the Fords and his attendance at court, he had made numerous preaching journeys. He had also written somewhat, and added a goodly number of maxims to those he had prepared when in concealment in the reign of William III. In 1711 he wrote a preface to the journal of an old Quaker friend, John Banks, and this seems to have been the last time he wrote for publication.

After he ceased to attend court he seems to have lived about eight miles from London, near Brentford. In 1710, however, when he was sixty-six he found his strength declining, and that the air near London did not suit him. He moved farther into the country, near Ruscombe, where he lived the rest of his life. About two years afterwards, while on a visit to London, he was taken ill of what he called a fever, and his wife called a "lethargic illness," and others "a kind of apoplectic fit" or "palsy." It was evidently what we would now call a stroke of paralysis.

He seems to have recovered, and was able to attend to his affairs. He had almost completed the sale of his government to the crown. His great difficulty was in the conditions on which the sale must be made. He wanted money; but he also

had a great reputation to maintain. He would not sell his right in a way that would jeopardize the principles on which the colony was founded, and its civil and religious liberty. It must always remain a secure refuge for the Quakers. All this must be made sure before he received a shilling; and he was very particular on this point in negotiating with the officers of the crown.

After his first stroke of paralysis he had brought the matter to a state that was satisfactory; a deed was ready to be signed, and £1000 had been paid him on account of the purchase money, which was to be £18,150. This sum, it will be observed, was about £2000 more than the £16,000 due from the crown to his father, in liquidation of which Pennsylvania had been granted.

But before he could sign the deed he was stricken again with paralysis while he was writing to Logan a letter which he could not finish, and which proved to be the last he ever wrote. He recovered sufficiently to attempt a little business, but within three or four months he was seized again in the same way.

These three strokes, all within a year, completely invalided him, and partially wrecked his mind. He had been a much hated and abused man in his life, and after his death his enemies circulated the story that he had died a raging madman. But there was no truth in it. His mind was merely weakened by the paralysis. He forgot his cares, and a certain serenity, which seemed partly natural and partly the result of his religion, remained.

But the sale could not be completed; for with his

mind impaired the deed would not have been valid if he had signed it. So the government of Pennsylvania as well as the ownership of the land remained with his family until the American Revolution of 1776.

In the year 1713, the year after he was stricken and his mind impaired, peace was at last declared, and the trade of the Delaware River immediately began to revive. This was the event for which he had been waiting many years, the event that would end the long wars in which his old enemy William III. had involved England. He had even hesitated in selling his government, expecting that he might hear of the cessation of hostilities at any time. He was confident that, as soon as peace came, his returns from sales of land and quit-rents would greatly increase and soon place him beyond any necessity of selling. But now the good time had come when his mind could no longer appreciate it, and the results had hardly time to gather very much headway before he had ceased to live.

His wife had taken charge of all his affairs; and she proved herself an excellent manager. The deputy governor was soon in a terrible quarrel with the Assembly, and his recall was demanded. Mrs. Penn dismissed him and appointed in his stead Sir William Keith, who had a prosperous and popular administration of ten years. Pennsylvania went to her and her children, while the English and Irish estates, at that time thought the more valuable, were settled on Guli's son William, who seems to have continued his dissipations.

In a few years, however, Pennsylvania became enormously valuable, and Penn's sons by his second wife became very rich men. So Penn's ambition of adding to his family fortune as well as establishing a refuge for the Quakers was realized at last. But the history of the management of the province by his sons and their great wealth cannot be given here.*

Penn's last years were very peaceful.

"Found him to appearance pretty well in health and cheerful of disposition, but defective in memory; so that, though he could relate many past transactions, yet he could not readily recollect the names of absent persons, nor could he deliver his words so readily as heretofore; yet many savory and sensible expressions came from him, rendering his company even yet acceptable, and manifesting the religious stability of his mind." (Life prefixed to his Works, vol. i. p. 150.)

He continued to decline very slowly and gradually for about six years. For two or three years there was not much change. He received the visits of his friends, and on Sundays was driven to meeting, where he sometimes spoke a few sentences, and on returning home took leave of his friends with great tenderness. He enjoyed walking out of doors, and when the weather was bad he diverted himself, as his wife tells us, from room to room of his large house. He took great delight in his children, and could scarcely bear to have his wife out of his sight. As long as she kept from him the thoughts of his business affairs he was happy; but if his mind was turned to his disastrous finances, or the deplorable

* See Pennsylvania: Colony and Commonwealth, pp. 66, 84, 122, 127, 128, 169, and passim.

PENN'S BURIAL-PLACE, JORDAN'S MEETING-HOUSE

condition of his interests in Pennsylvania, the effect was most unfortunate.

In 1716 he could no longer remember names, but appeared to know who the persons were who came to see him. The next year he scarcely knew any one, and could no longer walk without leading; and in the following year, 1718, on the 30th of July, at the age of seventy-four, he died.

Index

Affirmation instead of oath, 185.
Albigenses, 86.
AMYRAULT, Moses, 100.
Antinomians, 82, 84.
AUBREY, William, 339, 371.

BALTIMORE, Lord, 236.
BARCLAY, Robert, 121, 201, 285.
BAXTER, Penn's controversy with, 179.
BEVAN, Sylvanus, 16.
Bishops, the seven, 292.
BUCHAN, Earl of, 274.
BURNETT, Bishop, 28, 260, 271, 273, 317, 320.

CALLOWHILL, Hannah, marries Penn, 339.
CHARLES I., 35, 36.
CHARLES II., secret treaty with Louis XIX., 166; death of, 254.
Chester, name of, given to Upland, 231.
Civil war, the, 37.
COBHAM, Lord, 16.
COLE, Josiah, 198.
Congregationalists, 33.
CORNISH, 260.
Corruption in Admiral Penn's time, 44.
CRISP, William, 251, 252.
CROESE, Gerard, 256, 263, 310.

Dalrymple, 319 321.
Delaware, State of, 208, 230.
Delaware, the, scenery of, 231.
DYER, Mary, 84.

ELWOOD, John, 165.
England, condition of, in Penns' time, 111; coarseness of language and life in, 114, 116.
EVANS, Governor, 366, 368, 371, 376.
EVELYN waylaid by highwaymen, 112.
Exclusive salvation, doctrine of, 80.
Executions in Penn's time, 117.

Familists, 82, 83.
Fifth-Monarchy men, 34.
FLETCHER, Colonel Benjamin, 346.
FORD, Philip, 372–376.
FOX, George, 72–77, 122, 123, 132, 169, 173, 197, 215, 365.
Friendship, dangers of, 229.

Game on the Delaware, 232.
GAUNT, Elizabeth, 260.
Gentry of England, 43.
GOOKIN, Colonel Charles, 377.

HAMPDEN, John, 36.
HART, Charles Henry, 17.
Hat, anecdote of, with James II., 123.
HEAD, J. Merrick, 14.
HEMSKIRCK, Egbert, 18.
HICKS, Penn's controversy with, 170, 171.

Indians, Penn's treaty with, 242–247; treatment of, by Penn, 211.
Indulgence, Declaration of, by Charles II., 166, 173; Penn writes about it, 267; an indulgence by James II., 280; another by him, 291.
IVES, Penn's controversy with, 152.

JAMES II., Penn explains Quaker faith to, 123; professes liberality, 255; releases Quakers from prison, 255, 280, 290; his word for liberty, 281; flies to France, 292.
JEFFREYS, Judge, 257.
Jesuits, 296.

Kinsale, Penn goes to, 102.
KNELLER, Sir Godfrey, 19.

LABADIE, De, 183.
LAUD, Archbishop, 36.
LAWTON, Charlewood, 264, 280.
LESLIE criticises the Quakers, 122.
Liberty, Anglo-Saxon, 32.
——, Religious, Penn devotes himself to, 122; Penn writes on, 160, 189.
LLOYD, David, 368–370, 378.
LLOYD, Thomas, 254.
LOCKE, John, 263.
LOE, Thomas, 96, 199.
LOGAN, James, 349, 371, 377.
London in Penn's time, 113.
LOUIS XIX., secret treaty with Charles II., 166.
LUTTRELL, Narcissus, 300, 326, 330.

MACAULAY, Lord, 258–260, 303, 330.
Magdalen College, 287, 288.
MARKHAM, William, 208.
Maxims, Penn's, 26.
MEAD, William, arrested with Penn, 141.
Middle Ages, the, effect of, 77; religion of, 78–81.
Miracles in the Middle Ages, 79.
MONMOUTH, Duke of, 257.
Music in Penn's time, 118.

Navy, the, in Admiral Penn's time, 44, 46–48.
New Jersey, 200–202; proprietorship in, abolished, 364.
"No Cross, No Crown," 132.
NORRIS, Isaac, 375.

OATES, Titus, 186.
Oaths, Treatise of, by Penn, 22, 175–178.
Oxford in Penn's time, 62–64.

Parliament, Regulation of, by James II., 290.
PENN, Admiral, 39–57; rapid rise in the navy, 45; pursues Prince Rupert, 49; in the Dutch wars of Cromwell, 50; treachery of,

51, 52; in the Tower, 53; friend of the Duke of York, 54; Pepys's description of him, 55; Clarendon's description, 56; impeached, 56; fortune of, 57.
PENN, Dennis, 339.
——, Giles, 43, 45.
——, Hannah, 339.
——, John, 339.
——, John, the American, 349.
——, Lady, 39, 40.
——, Letitia, 339.
——, Margaret, 339.
——, Mrs., visits James II., of France, 333.
——, Richard, 339.
——, Springett, 339.
——, Thomas, 339.
——, William, portraits of him, 12–20; his character and traits, 20–30; birth, 31, 38; his mother, 39; ancestry, 41, 42, 43; early political influences, 58, 59; early religious influences, 60; goes to college, 61, 65; his use of "thee" and "thou," 68; reasons for joining the Quakers, 95; revolts against surplices at Oxford, 96; expelled from college, 97; turned out of doors by his father, 98; travels in France and Italy, 98, 99; fights in Paris, 100; studies under Amyrault, 100; studies law, 101; goes to Ireland, 102; becomes a soldier, 103; joins the Quakers, 104; first imprisonment, 107, 108; turned out of doors again, 110; protests against obscenity, 115; becomes a preacher, 121; retains his sword, 123; becomes a controversialist, 124; goes to court, 125; controversy with Vincent, 126; writes "The Sandy Foundation," 126–130; imprisoned for "Sandy Foundation," 131; writes "No Cross, No Crown," 132; writes "Innocency with her Open Face," 135; released from prison, 136; goes again to Ireland, 138; reconciled to his father, 140; arrested in Gracechurch meeting, 140; defends trial by jury, 142–146; released by his father, 149; death of his father, 150; becomes rich, 151; controversy with Ives, 152; attacks vice-chancellor of Oxford, 153, 154; suspected of being a Jesuit, 154, 155; arrested as dangerous to the government, 156–161; goes to Holland, 162; marries, 166; traditions of, as a preacher, 168; controversy with Hicks, 170; secures release of Fox, 175; his "Treatise of Oaths," 175–178; argues again on religious liberty, 178, 179; controversy with Baxter, 179; goes to Holland, 181–184; appeals to Parliament for affirmation instead of oath, 185; supports Sydney for Parliament, 192; argues that Protestants should unite, 194; proposes new test oath, 195; asks for the grant of Pennsylvania, 197; first suggestions of Pennsylvania, 199; his connection with New

Jersey, 200; vast size of Pennsylvania, 206; charter of Pennsylvania, 207; obtains Delaware, 208; sends out Markham, 208; advertises for settlers, 209; his motives, 210; treatment of the Indians, 211; lays out Philadelphia, 213, 214; resists Wilkinson's demand for more liberty, 215; consults with Sydney about constitution, 217; consults with many others, 220; numerous drafts for Constitution, 221–226; advanced ideas of government, 225–228; starts for the province, 229, 230; arrives in the Delaware, 231; visits the site of Philadelphia, 234; goes to Maryland, 236; passes the winter at Chester, 237; delighted with his province, 238; his famous treaty with the Indians, 242–247; travels to the Susquehanna, 248; his letter to Free Society of Traders, 248; returns to England, 250; takes up liberty of conscience again, 253; losses by the province, 254; becomes a courtier, 256; his description of Monmouth's rebellion, 258; accused of extorting money for Taunton maids, 259; attends the execution of Cornish and Gaunt, 259, 260; a pardon obtainer, 261; difficulty of his position with the king, 261; his work as a courtier, 262, 263; extravagance of his life as a courtier, 265; another journey to Holland, 270; visits the Prince of Orange, 271; losses by Pennsylvania, 277; encourages grape-growing in Pennsylvania, 278; supports Declaration of Indulgence, 280; favors abolishing the test laws, 283; his anonymous pamphlet in support of James II., 283; supports James II.'s Declaration of Indulgence, 286; believed in James II., 286; inconsistency to his position, 289; tries to win Lawton to the king, 293; his association with Jeffreys, 294; given a chance to explain himself, 296; replies to Popple's letter, 298; position in the revolution of 1688, 302–305; arrested on suspicion of treason, 305; his opinion of the Toleration Act, 307; accused by Macaulay of plotting, 309; receives a letter from James II., 310; prepares to go to Pennsylvania, 313; attempt to arrest him, 314; goes into hiding, 314; appeals to Henry Sydney, 318; inclines to turn state's evidence, 322; negotiations with the government, 323–326; goes to France, 326; seizure of the government of Pennsylvania, 327; negotiates again with the government, 328; set free at last, 329; still suspected of treason, 331; his occupations while in hiding, 332; his argument for arbitration, 333; death of his wife, 334; un-

popularity in Pennsylvania, 335; unpopularity among the Quakers in England, 335; his government returned to him, 337; preaching journeys, 338; second marriage, 339; proposes union of the colonies, 341; sails for Pennsylvania, 342; confused methods of government, 344; attempt at despotism, 345; arrives in the province, 348; puts down the pirates, 350; enjoys himself at Pennsbury, 352; his life there, 353; visits the Susquehanna again, 355; visits Maryland, 356; his losses by the province, 357; obliged to return to England, 358; gives the people a constitution, 358; becomes a courtier under Queen Anne, 362; deeply in debt, 364; tries to sell his government, 365; violent address against him from the province, 369; reaction in his favor, 370; dealings with Philip Ford, 372–376; imprisoned for debt, 374; dismisses Evans, 376; reaction in his favor again, 378; hope from a silver-mine, 380; first stroke of paralysis, 381; mind impaired, 382; great improvements in Pennsylvania, 383; last years, 384.

——, William, Jr., 339; becomes dissipated, 360; sent to Pennsylvania, 361, 366; returns from Pennsylvania, 367.

PENNINGTON, Isaac, 164.

Pennsbury, 253, 352, 354.

Penns-Lodge, 43.

Pennsylvania, origin of, 197; boundary disputes of, 205; vast size of, 206; charter of, 207; constitution of, by Penn, 221, 226; condition of, on Penn's arrival, 231; seizure of the government of, 327.

Peter the Great, of Russia, 340.

Petre, Father, 291.

Philadelphia, origin of name, 213; streets of, as laid out by Penn, 235; building of, 239, 240.

Piracy in Pennsylvania, 350.

PLACE, Francis, 15.

Plague in London, 101.

Plot, popish, 186.

Popish plot, 186.

Popple's letter to Penn, 297.

Portraits of Penn, 12–20.

Presbyterians, 33.

Preston, Lord, 312, 317, 319, 320.

PROUD, Robert, 17.

Puritans, 32, 33, 36.

Quakers, the, dress of, 21; eccentricities of, 69; doctrines of, 70, 71; objection to politics, 72; objection to war, 72; the return to primitive Christianity, 85, 86; legislation against, 87, 88–91; heroism of, 89, 90; philanthropy and liberalism of, 92; distinguished men among, 93; rationalism of, 94; thirteen hundred released by James II., 255.

QUARRY, Colonel, 349.

Ranters, 76, 82.

RAYNAL, his opinion of the treaty with the Indians, 246.

Reformation, the, 32, 81, 84.
RICHARDSON, Jonathan, 20.
Rights, Bill of, 309.
ROBINSON, Sir John, puts Penn in Newgate, 159.
Roundheads, 31.
Royalists, 31, 35.

SACHSE, Julius F., 18.
"Sandy Foundation, The," 126–130.
Seekers, 82, 83.
Ship-money, 36.
Slate-roof house, the, 349.
Small-pox on Penn's ship, 230.
SPRINGETT, Guli, 163–166; visits James II. in France, 333.
STUART, Major W. D., 14.
——, Robert, of Coltness, 274.
SUNDERLAND, Lord, 275.
Surplice, rebellion against, 65.
Susquehanna, expeditions to, 248, 355.
Sword, Penn retains his, 123.
SYDNEY, Algernon, 192, 193, 217–219.
——, Henry, 276, 318, 322–324.

TILLOTSON, Dr., 262.
Toleration Act, the, 306.
Traders, Free Society of, 248.
Treaty, the, with the Indians, 242–247.
TURNER, Mrs., 40, 41.

VICKRIS, Richard, 253.
VINCENT, Penn's controversy with, 126.
VOLTAIRE, his opinion of the treaty with the Indians, 245, 246.

Waldenses, the, 86.
Wanstead, Penn's life at, 58, 59.
WATERHOUSE, Alfred, 18.
WEST, Benjamin, 20, 243.
WILLIAM III. argues against Penn, 271; his ideas of toleration, 273; comes to England, 292; becomes less popular in England, 313; dies, 361.
Witchcraft, 79.
WOOD, Rebecca, 355.

YORK, Duke of, 166 174, 208.

THE END

HOME USE
CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT
MAIN LIBRARY

This book is due on the last date stamped below.
1-month loans may be renewed by calling 642-3405.
6-month loans may be recharged by bringing books to Circulation Desk.
Renewals and recharges may be made 4 days prior to due date.
ALL BOOKS ARE SUBJECT TO RECALL 7 DAYS AFTER DATE CHECKED OUT.

DEC 27 1974 3 4

REC'D CIRC DEPT DEC 6 '75

LD21—A-40m-5,'74
(R8191L)

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

224094

F152
.2
F5

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY